

Th. Sect.

"BRITISH OPINION and COLONIAL POLICY, 1783-1839;

in particular, the origin of the ideas

of the Colonial Reformers."

by

Albert Jackson Weir, B.A.



Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

Degree awarded 17th July 1924.

C O N T E N T S.

CHAPTER.		PAGE.
I	Opinion and the Old Empire.	1.
II	British North America. 1783-1793.	28.
III	The Last Navigation Act, 1783-1793.	83.
IV	Convicts, Slaves and Aborigines. 1783-1793.	120.
V	The War Years, 1793-1815.	171.
VI	Emigration.	204.
VII	Robert Fleming Gourlay.	216.
VIII	Wilmot Horton and the Emigration Committees.	265.
IX	Systematic Colonization, 1829-1839. (A) Social and Economic.	316.
X	Systematic Colonization, 1829-1839. (B) Political.	371.
	Appendices.	405.
	Bibliography.	425.

CHAPTER I.

OPINION AND THE OLD EMPIRE.

"The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to plague us."

The question has been much debated whether Britain learned the lesson taught by the loss of the American Colonies. The controversy implies that in the period following 1783 the path of error so disastrously pursued before that date was trod to some extent again. That the second Empire presented problems similar to those of the first, is of the very nature of things. But none were so critical, so momentous, so dramatic. The questions of the testing years between the passing of the Stamp Act and the skirmish at Lexington are the questions of the succeeding epoch written large. Reference to the American question, and the part played therein by British opinion, is essential by way of brief introduction to this study

The part of opinion in the development of the Empire prior to the American crisis cannot be treated. It might be stated merely that as compared with other colonising states the British Empire in its earlier stages was pre-eminently the outcome of opinion, broadly conceived. It was the opinion, the thought of the nation, which inspired the first explorers and colonists. In the spirit of national adventure Sir Humphrey Gilbert sacrificed his life, and Sir Walter Raleigh his fortune.

(2)

Private initiative launched expeditions and the sovereign shared the profits. The New Zealand Land Company of 1837 is the lineal descendant of the chartered companies in which the Stuart kings were shareholders. Adventure and profit in the spacious days of Elizabeth became profit and adventure under her successors, public opinion endorsing the change of emphasis, administration formulating the rules of the game. The policy of the self-sufficient empire based on the mercantile theory had universal, or all but universal, support during the seventeenth, and three-quarters of the eighteenth, century. Ships, colonies and commerce, mutually self-supporting, were popularly accepted as the bases of England's greatness.⁽¹⁾ The nation largely acquiesced in the favouritism with which the dominant Whigs treated the merchants. The times were mercenary in every sense of the term. Burke's condemnation of counting-house legislation in the familiar tag regarding the relative efficacy of figures of arithmetic and of rhetoric in the House of Commons, is but a

(1) As Lord Haversham put it in the House of Lords, speaking early in the eighteenth century: "Your Fleet and your Trade have so near a relation, and such mutual influence upon each other they cannot well be separated; your trade is the mother and nurse of your seamen; your seamen are the life of your fleet, and your fleet is the security and protection of your trade, and both together are the wealth, strength, and security and glory of Britain." Parl. Hist. VI. 598.
Cf. Beer, "The Old Colonial System" Pt.I. (in 2vols) 1912. I.p.16

(2) "All the Discoveries, as well as great Commercial Establishments now existing in distant Parts of the Globe, have been owing to the Enterprize and persevering Exertions of Individuals, who at great personal Risks, frequent Losses, and in some Cases total Ruin, have opened the Way to the greatest National advantages". - Report of Commons Committee on Convicts, July 28, 1785, "Reports" (1715 - 1801), X, p.1164.

slight stricture on "the baneful spirit of commerce that wished
 to govern great Nations on the Maxims of the Counter"⁽¹⁾. From the
 very earliest years of expansion, administrators facilitated, or
 endeavoured to prevent, emigration, as public opinion regarded it
 as a wise outlet for an overflowing population, or as an undue
 drain on the man-power of the state. It is significant of the
 relatively large part played in the evolution of the empire by
 movements arising directly from the people, that it proved
 impossible for government to direct emigration as it wished. The
 economic interest of England, it seemed, required the develop-
 ment of the island rather than the continental colonies: but in
 spite of the action to secure that end, the emigrating Britons
 of the period in the main sought their homes in New England
 and Virginia.⁽²⁾

Adventure, profit, homes, - these were the desiderata which
 prompted the oversea movement of the British public. These were
 the ends for consideration in policy. Adventure, from "singeing
 the Spanish King's beard" to the Jameson Raid, called for no
 regulation in advance, though the stirring initiative of
 individuals has resulted, now to the empire's permanent advantage
 and, again, to its serious embarrassment. Profit, on the other

(1) Cf. Lecky, "History of England in the Eighteenth Century"
 1906, II. p.241. Also Egerton, "Short History of British Colonial
 Policy", 1897, p.57; "Causes and Character of the American
 Revolution", 1923, p.49.

(2) Beer, op. cit. I. pp. 34 - 35, 54.

hand, was formally adopted by the state as the end which justified a colonial empire. The mercantile system marked the evolution of a new stage in national development.⁽¹⁾ In common with the states of Europe, England evolved a "complex system of regulations, whose fundamental aim was to create a self-sufficient commercial empire of mutually complementary parts".⁽²⁾ Unlike some of these peoples the genius of Englishmen did not lend itself to the formal drafting of a set of rules circumscribing and directing the political life of the various parts of the empire. But for the coincidence of the emergence of the need for development in this direction with the accession to the throne of a monarch, whose aims were not in consonance with the constitutional movement of the times, it seems probable that a practical working solution of the problem of the rights of men in the colonies would have been reached. In the period 1783-1839, migrating Britons still seek adventure, profit, and homes in the colonies. In this period again it is the third motive for emigration, the felt need of freer, more promising conditions of living, which proves most influential in shaping colonial policy, both with regard to the measure of expansion which the period brings, and the problems with which it is confronted.

(1) Gustav Schmoller, "The Mercantile System". (in "Economic Classics", ed. by W. J. Ashley) pp. 59ff.

(2) Beer, op.cit. p.VII.

(1)

The passing of the Stamp Act almost without opposition shows how completely ministers and the public at large failed to gauge its possible consequences. The consistent failure to comprehend the point of view of the colonists is one of the outstanding features of the American question. In 1765, there was more excuse for the general ignorance than at any later period. Then even Franklin felt that the colonies must submit. George III was one of the first to recognise the gravity of the situa-

(2)

tion. It is difficult to avoid the use of terms which suggest a reference to fate, in speaking of the tragic necessity for a definition of the most difficult nature within the imperial constitution, at a time when the belated effort of a British monarch to exercise an obsolete prerogative put the British constitution itself to the test. Grenville framed the Stamp Act on what he considered the Whig principle of the sovereignty of Parliament. As such it won the adhesion of individuals and factions in accord with the general constitutional development following the Revolution of 1688. By the irony of chance the carrying out of the policy it introduced fell to a Tory ministry, at a time when the instinctive national allegiance to the personal monarch was newly re-awakened, and at the very

(1) Lecky, op.cit. IV, p.74. Burke calls the debate "languid."

(2) He wrote Conway, December, 1765, "It is undoubtedly the most serious matter that ever came before Parliament". Albemarle, "Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham", 2 vols., 1852, vol.I, p256.

moment when the crown had achieved a distinct success through corrupt influence in furthering its extra-constitutional purposes. Not only that: the leader of the opposition for whom public opinion, both at home and in the colonies, had the highest regard, found himself, by the exigencies of the situation, half in sympathy with the king's success in breaking the power of the Whig oligarchy. To this, as weakening Chatham's effective force in demanding practical measures of conciliation, must be added the ravages of disease which withdrew him for long periods from the political arena. The opposition, other than Chatham, contained able men; but they found no common ground. The American question played the part of a stimulating agent in the chemistry of political reaction, precipitating a number of domestic problems, such as parliamentary reform, which threw the already deeply-cleft opposition into utter confusion. ⁽¹⁾ "An anarchy of opinion" ⁽²⁾ is Horace Walpole's phrase.

If the decision to tax America aroused no opposition in 1765, the bill for the repeal of the Stamp Act sufficiently agitated it. The imperial issue was beginning to be realised. The debate was long and bitter. American violence made the action of the Rockingham ministry difficult. The Declaratory Act, the promise of which ensured the passing of the repeal bill, has been

(1) Burke's "Correspondence", edited Fitzwilliam and Bourke, 4 vols., 1844. vol.II, p.385, 386.

(2) Letter to Rev. W. Mason, June 29, 1780.

unreasonably attacked. The principle it enunciated had the endorsement of the best legal authorities in the kingdom, Lord Camden excepted. To defend the authority of Parliament so wantonly defied was essential. It would appear that the defect of statesmanship lay in the failure to follow up the acts of 6 George III with something constructive aimed at finding a place within the constitution for the self-governing rights of the colonists. As it was, the repeal of the Stamp Act was received with acclaim, both in England and America.⁽¹⁾ In England, the commercial classes rejoiced in the restoration of trade, many of them men, who, in a few year's time, were to acquiesce willingly enough in the policy of coercion and the war it entailed. The land-owning classes were the less averse from the abandonment of the present endeavor to draw revenue from America, in that it promised to be a total failure. In America, as Franklin had suggested, the theoretical assertion of the legislative supremacy of Parliament was little regarded in the general exultation at their victory.

Loyal addresses from America were, however, unaccompanied by votes of supply. The court party held that the withdrawal of the Stamp Act had been humiliating. The common sense justice of America's contributing towards the upkeep of her own defence gave powerful support to the agitation of the party of the King's Friends. The weakness of the Grafton-Chatham ministry afforded

(1) Albemarle, op.cit. I, p.250, 301: p.314 - "an event that caused more universal joy throughout the British Empire than perhaps any other." (Burke)

the opportunity. Charles Townsend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, believed in the principle of the Stamp Act. Speaking to Grenville's motion that America should provide her own army, he declared his conviction that he could secure the means of her doing so. He pursued his eloquent, infatuated course to the dismay of his colleagues, to the delight of the nominal opposition. (1) Only his dismissal ^{would} have stayed him in what was a popular, and probably a sincere course: Chatham's illness left no one in the Cabinet to take that step. The acts Townsend introduced in May, 1767, were three in number. (2) The last imposed duties on glass, red and white lead, painters' colours, paper and tea. It avoided the objection so strenuously raised to the Stamp Act. Port duties could not be described as internal taxation. But nothing was gained thereby. This act was equally objectionable. Its end was revenue, not commercial regulation. (3) This was the ground taken in America. The preceding two years had brought a most serious widening of the controversy, of which this is an indication. It was now maintained from platform and from pulpit, perhaps still more effectively by press and pamphlet, that the Parliament of the

(1) "The whole body of courtiers drove him on". Burke, "On American Taxation", 1774.

(2) That establishing a Board of Commissioners of the Customs, 7 Geo. III. c. 41, Professor Egerton points out in an interesting footnote, "produced a remarkable effect in stopping illegalities and increasing revenue." His authority is Dr. Morison, Oxford Harmsworth Professor of American History. "The Causes and Character of the American Revolution", p. 95.

(3) Shelburne had in mind a source of revenue which suggests Edward Gibbon Wakefield. He would form "an American fund", "by taking proper care of the quit ~~rents~~ rents, and by turning the grants of land to real benefit". Fitzmaurice, "Shelburne" II. p. 35.

mother country had neither the right to tax, nor to legislate for, the free peoples of America. At this stage public opinion in Britain must be more closely examined.

Before the Townsend duties, Chatham had predicted that New York's failure to comply with the Mutiny Act would "create a great ferment here -----and leave no room to any to say a word in their defence."⁽¹⁾ The landowners actively concurred in the renewed effort to draw revenue from America. They had taken part in the factious combination which forced a reduction in the land tax on the government. Horace Walpole records that "the Country gentlemen had been as much to blame-----as the Court. "They had remained pleased spectators ----- hoping for a "revenue from America to lessen the land-tax."⁽²⁾ The merchants were only temporarily embarrassed; the non-importation agreements shortly broke down. Further, the increased demand in America which was the involuntary consequence of the threatened renewal of popular restrictions on importations, made amends for the slack period that was to follow; and contributed to suggest patience to British merchants in the hope of another resumption of commercial intercourse. As the issue grew more clearly on the general public, distracting matters in both foreign and domestic affairs thrust themselves forward. France and Spain

(1) Chatham , "Correspondence", III, p.188.

(2) Walpole, "Journal of the Reign of King George III, 1771-1783". (short title, "Last Journals",) Edited Dr. Doran, 2vols., 1859, II, p.360.

intrigued to regain the position they had lost to Pitt's war genius. Reports of French spies mapping the English coast, and agents of Choiseul investigating the ground for French hopes in the colonies, seem to have stiffened the national opposition to colonial truculence. "The torrent of indignation in Parliament" which Chatham foresaw, found intemperate expression in the renewal of the Act of 35 Henry VIII for trying political offenders in England. Townsend's death, Shelburne's dismissal, Chatham's resignation, North's ministry followed in quick succession. Meanwhile the Middlesex election tended to engross the attention of the nation.

The lull in American affairs was transitory. The "Boston Massacre" occurred while Lord North was removing the 1767 duties. Three-pence a pound continued to be required of colonial consumers of tea, as compared with a duty of a shilling collected in England. It was with the utmost reluctance that the leader of the administration retained even this trivial impost. The King insisted on "one tax to keep up the right",⁽¹⁾ and the minister began a long unfortunate course of acquiescence against his better judgment. The casualties of the night of March 5, 1770, together with the retention of the tea duty, served to further the actively-agitated cause of inter-colonial unity. Between the burning of the 'Gaspee' and the dumping of the tea in

(1) George III to North, September 11, 1774.
 "The Correspondence of George III with Lord North, 1768 - 1783".
 Edited by W. B. Donne, 2 vols., 1868, I, p.202.

Boston harbour, occurred Franklin's examination before a large committee of the Privy Council. Lecky notes that such distinguished strangers as Burke, Priestly, and Jeremy Bentham crowded the Bar. Instead of being heard with judicial decorum, Wedderburn's eloquent vituperation was received by the gathering with indecent enthusiasm. This onslaught on the character of an outstanding colonial may have had some justification in fact. It had none in policy. Its reception indicates all too accurately the tendency among Britons, from the highest to the lowest, to condemn the personal character of the colonists. It added fuel to the deepening resentment of the Americans. Boston, a contemporary wrote, became as warm as New York. The Solicitor-general was burned in effigy "for his aspersing Dr. Franklin"⁽¹⁾ When the penal legislation of 1774 was enacted, the King was justified, in writing, "The dye (sic) is now cast, the colonies must either submit or triumph."⁽²⁾

The die was cast. The bulk of the nation was determined on coercion. In addition, by far the greater number of professional men, "the three great bodies of the clergy, army and law,"⁽³⁾ supported the court and the ministry. The King insisted on firmness; and his subjects concurred that their self-respect demanded

(1) Walpole, op.cit., I, p.373.

(2) George III to North, September 11, 1774. Donne, op.cit. p. 202.

(3) Walpole, op.cit., II, p.91.

that the authority of Parliament should be upheld. The bishops voted for the four coercive measures of 1774, including the Quebec Act, which, its opponents claimed, established Roman Catholicism and tolerated Protestantism. The landed interest was altogether anti-American, Scotland almost wholly, and Ireland, with the particular exception of the northern Presbyterians. The literary world largely endorsed the right to tax. Dean Tucker and Adam Smith concurred in this. Johnson's fierce support is quoted elsewhere. The pious and humane Cowper asked what else the king could do than persist in maintaining his prerogative and the sovereignty of Parliament. The election of the year 1774 strengthened the ministry. The government majority on the first significant question in the new parliament was as four to one.

What strength the opposition had was largely to be found among the dissenting and commercial classes. Yet in both of these a powerful faction favoured the ministerial policy. Dr. Price's "Essay on Liberty" associated the American cause with constitutional reform in the home country. It was widely read. On the other hand, John Wesley recast the arguments of Dr. Johnson in popular form, making an effective appeal for the King's cause. The same schism appears among the mercantile interests. The reopening of the Baltic trade gave them an eastern outlet for their goods. The petition of the London merchants on behalf of

(1) Letter to Rev. John Newton, Jan. 13, 1782. Cf. Donne, op. cit., II, p. 402.

conciliation was presented by the brother-in-law of Wilkes.⁽¹⁾ It was discounted as factious. Manchester was still strongly Tory in sentiment. When the war did come, it was as "a sort of substitute for commerce"⁽²⁾ with many trades and manufacturers.

In the House as in the country the opposition was lamentably weak. "To extend the prerogative", the government "had taught the people to be warm for the sovereignty over America".⁽³⁾ The Duke of Portland wrote, "the desire I feel of leaving nothing undone that "can give the public a true idea of the present state of this "country, the deceits of administration, and the true ground of "our opposition to the impolitic and violent measures adopted by "them, makes me venture to suggest the propriety of some endeavors to obviate the effect, which the idea of supporting the "legislative power of Great Britain over every part of her "dominions, has but too generally acquired over the quiet, "unthinking minds of people in general."⁽⁴⁾ Burke found "the good people of England" partaking "every day, more and more, of the "character of that administration which they have been induced to "tolerate". He continued, "I do not think that weeks or even

(1) Hayley by name. Cf. Walpole, op.cit. I, p.446.

(2) Burke to the Marquis of Rockingham, August 23, 1775. "The greatest number of them begin to snuff the cadaverous 'haut gout' of lucrative war!" "Correspondence", II, p.50.

(3) Walpole, op.cit. I, p.439.

(4) Letter to Burke, October 5, 1775. Burke's "Correspondence", II, pp.76, 77.

"months or years, will bring the monarch, the ministers, or the
 "people, to feeling".⁽¹⁾ He, too, would urge some public demonstra-
 tion supported by the united Whig party. The proposal was not
 acted upon. The opposition suffered in consequence. The
 ministry secured, what Burke foretold, "a lease of power as long
 as the war (continued)".⁽²⁾ Walpole said the Whig failure was
 "because they never took the least pains to raise a spirit but in
 "parliament, the last place where it could be raised, as the
 "members were more evidently corrupted than any man".⁽³⁾ Even there,
 the Whigs brought discredit on their cause by their obvious
 partisanship, and by adopting the rebel forces as "our Army".⁽⁴⁾

The war was popular, though recruiting went slowly.⁽⁵⁾ "If
 "there is one thing in history more clear than another, it is that
 "the English nation, at the beginning of the American War, were
 "united almost to a man in favour of the prosecution of the war".⁽⁶⁾
 A leading Whig acknowledged that the ministry had the nation with
 them, and deplored his party as "patriots out of the opinion of
 "the public".⁽⁷⁾ The entry of France into the war strengthened the

(1) Letter to the Marquis of Rockingham, August 23, 1775, Burke's "Correspondence", pp.47, 48, 50.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Walpole, op.cit. II, p.233.

(4) Cf. Fox, "the terrible news from Long Island," used of English victories.

(5) Walpole, op.cit., I, p.500.

(6) W. E. Gladstone speaking to the members of the Mechanics' Institute, Chester, 12 Nov., 1855; "Our Colonies", speech under that title in pamphlet form.

(7) Sir George Savile, Albemarle, op.cit., II, p.305.

hands of the ministry. It "made men think rather of the whole than of parties"⁽¹⁾. As late as September, 1779, Camden wrote that the people wanted no change of leadership. Strangely enough the Gordon Riots helped the government. George III gained prestige by his personal conduct. The agitation and reaction distracted attention from ministerial corruption, on which the opposition, with a final show of unanimity, was endeavouring to fasten. Generally it demonstrated the need of strengthening the forces of law and order. With regard to the county meetings, North "still insisted that petitions, no more than protests, spoke the sense of counties, only of individuals"⁽²⁾. The participation of country gentlemen in the county movement was a sign, however, of war-weariness. When they began to desert the ministry in divisions, the end of the King's fight for personal government was in sight. The war had fitted in with his purposes. The surrender at Yorktown practically concluded both contests.

It is clear that the King's war had a very large measure of support from public opinion. The expression used of the struggle, "the King's War", suggests the query, "Did the majority acquiesce, like North, or was the civil strife an expression of the real will of that majority?" The answer is vital to the purpose of the present consideration.

(1) Walpole, op.cit., II, p.232.

(2) Ibid. II, p.368.

The view that the King was more to blame than his subjects of the United Kingdom has been long entertained. It is certain⁽¹⁾ that he kept the nation at war: that for five years he kept North, his "sheet anchor",⁽²⁾ at his post; that he kept him surrounded by colleagues "whose sentence was war". The King's letters repeat such sentiments as, "Every means of distressing America must meet with my concurrence, as it tends to bringing them to feel the necessity of returning to ~~their~~⁽³⁾ duty". On the other hand, this very broad sanction of aggressive action is given the best possible basis - to bring the colonists back to their duty. The King, too, had acquiesced in the conciliatory measure of 1775. Enigmatic though its terms were, "the treasury bench seemed to totter", "the numerous high prerogative party" "considered themselves as abandoned and betrayed".⁽⁴⁾ Again, in December, 1779, realising that the ~~terms~~ of the opposition, if summoned to office, would involve his unconditional surrender, the King claimed to set aside his personal opinions - "My first object shall be the good

(1) During a recent American tour, Mr. Lloyd George is reported to have advocated more cordial relations, in part, on the ground that the first estrangement sprang from the stubbornness of "a half-mad king".

Cf. Lecky, op.cit., IV, p.456, 458, where the King's refusal to send for Chatham is described as "the most criminal in the whole reign". The American view of Chatham is condensed in Burke's sentence regarding their petition of 1775 - "Lord Chatham is the idol as usual". "Correspondence", II, p.57.

(2) George III to North, Nov. 7, 1775. Donne, op.cit. I, p.286.

(3) George III to North, Oct. 15, 1775. Ibid. I, p.274.

(4) Annual Register, 1775. p.97.

(1)
of my people".

The King's attitude is the more worthy of examination in that he is so typical of the England of his day. (2) Like his subjects, he was woefully mis-informed. General Gage assured him (3) that the Americans "will be lyons (sic) while we are lambs". He (4) is said to have been much impressed with Dr. Johnson's pamphlet. Like his subjects, too, he was unable to transcend the "estate" (5) conception of colonies. The Americans belonged to England; therefore her sovereignty followed. Perhaps the fullest possible defence of the king lies in the very identity of his views with those of Englishmen generally. George III and North have been

(1) Letter to the Lord Chancellor, December 18, 1779. Donne, op.cit., II, p.298.

(2) "His sentiments or prejudices afford, however, an admirable index to the public opinion of England during his reign. His errors were some of them great enough, but his opinion was always, or almost always, the opinion of the average English elector". The war with the colonies is the first in a list of subjects cited by Professor A. V. Dicey, regarding which the King's feelings were those of his subjects. - "Law and Public Opinion in England", pp. 105, 106, note.

(3) George III to North, Feb. 4, 1774, Donne, op.cit. I, p.164.

(4) "Taxation no Tyranny", however, contains such specious logic as the argument that the longer the Americans have escaped taxation, "the better they can pay". It has been remarked that "By a similar process of arguing, Hampden might have been shown to have been in arrears for ship-money, and Prynne for ears". Donne, op.cit., II, p.9, note. "Works", 12 vols. 1792, VIII, p.189.

(5) Such language was very natural. The colonial of that day as of this remarked on it. Speaking in the City Chambers, Edinburgh, Admiral of the Fleet Sir F. C. Doveton Sturdee said, of the launching of H.M.S. "Victory" (the first of that name), "At that time we did not own a single square yard of land outside of England." Of 1560, as here used, the phraseology is strictly correct. "Scotsman", October 24, 1923.

(1)

made the scapegoats for the nation's sins. "They were only the organs and representatives of all the lurking ignorance and

(2)

arbitrary humours of the entire community". In his Bristol Speech, Burke presents what is perhaps the best contemporary view of the essential attitude of the people of Britain to the American War.

"It is but too true that there are many whose whole scheme of freedom is made up of pride, perverseness and insolence. They feel themselves in a state of thralldom, they imagine that their souls are cooped and cabined in, unless they have some man or some body of men dependent on their mercy. The desire of having some one below them, descends to those who are the very lowest of all; and a Protestant cobbler, debased by his poverty, but exalted by his share of the ruling church, feels a pride in knowing it is by his generosity alone that the peer, whose footman's instep he measures, is able to keep his chaplain from a goal. This disposition is the true source of the passion which many men, in very humble life, have taken to the American War, our subjects in America; our colonies; our dependents.(3) This lust of party power is the liberty they hunger and thirst for; and this siren song of ambition has charmed ears that we would have thought were never organised to that sort of music."

The tendency to despise the personal character of the colonists was very general. Cowardice was attributed to them by

(1) G. C. Lewis, "Administrations of Great Britain, 1783 - 1830" Ed. by Sir Edmund Head, 1864, p. 16, cites Lord Holland's view that it was the King alone who prevented reconciliation with America. He agrees with Lord John Russell's opposition to this contention. Cf. Annual Register, 1774, p.59.

(2) Morley, "Burke", (English Men of Letters), p. 78.

(3) "Every man in England seems to consider himself as a piece of a sovereign over America, seems to jostle himself at the throne with the King, and talks of our subjects in the colonies." Cf. Franklin, "Works," Ed. by A. H. Smyth, 1907, p. 400.

"This people, however, is too proud, and too much despises the Americans, to bear the thought of admitting them to such an equitable participation in the government of the whole".

many who should have known better, among them Lieutenant-Governor Oliver, and Generals Wolfe and Murray. General Gage's characterisation of them and its weight with the King have been cited. Nearly the whole English nation regarded the Americans as a rabble. "Johnson," says Boswell, "breathed out threatenings and slaughter, calling them rascals, robbers, pirates, and exclaiming "that he'd burn and destroy them". His pamphlet indulged in idle and thrasonical speculation on the ease with which they could be defeated, displaying gross ignorance, too, of mere natural obstacles to the subjugation of such a country. The invectives of Thurlow and Mansfield, the gross abuse of Franklin by Wedderburn, were authoritative pronouncements by leading ministers.

This being the attitude of king and people alike in the mother country, it might appear that the loss of the American colonies was inevitable. With this thought succeeding generations consoled themselves, quoting Turgot's aphorism. It must be admitted that even the most superficial examination of the character and institutions of the colonists strengthens the argument for inevitability. John Adams held that the settlement of New England was a deliberate protest against tyranny, ecclesiastical and civil. The late Mr. G. L. Beer's view is strongly put, that "the colonisation of New England was not the result of a normal movement of expansion, but was rather a political and religious schism in the state."⁽¹⁾ Professor Egerton's

(1) "The Old Colonial System", op.cit., I, p.54.

latest work seems to lean to the "inevitable" interpretation, that it was beyond the imaginative capacity of the English statesmen of the day to conceive of "an empire consisting of component parts, each in its way retaining complete local self-government".⁽¹⁾

The view that the revolution was inevitable is, however, difficult to accept. Surely it is not necessary to prove that the status quo as it exists imperially today could have been suggested by one or other of the able statesmen of that day, to show that the colonies need not have been lost to the empire. British constitutional development itself has been proverbially by tentative advances, by expedients framed for the situation of the moment. Pownall's "grandmarine dominion" suggested, as early as 1764, a way out. - "for twenty years a British Union, with colonial representatives admitted to the Parliament in Britain, had been recommended repeatedly by those who knew the circumstances of both countries".⁽²⁾ Representation would, perhaps, not have worked, at least, not in the later stages of the question.⁽³⁾ Without its having been tried, it is foolish to be dogmatic on the point. But an approximation to twin governments under one crown,

(1) "The Causes and Character of the American Revolution", pp. 198, 2, 16. He finds that Benjamin Franklin "almost alone" grasped the idea of this equality. See above, p. 18, note 3.

(2) D. P. Heatley, "Studies in British History and Politics", 1913, p. 173, quoting Pownall, "Administration of the Colonies", Pt. I, 1764; pt. II, 1774.

(3) Cf. Burke to Baron Mazeret, (n.d.) "Correspondence", II, pp. 310, 311, "No amount of humiliation will make America ever believe that the real substantial purposes of representation can be answered by sending representatives to the other side of the globe".

a general scheme"that had no need to be definitive"⁽¹⁾, was surely not beyond the limit of what was possible in statesmanship. Surely the relation of England to Scotland under the Stuarts afforded a rough precedent. The aversion of the colonists to the corruption which was rife in England might naturally have stimulated some sympathy with their feeling,hard though it be for the sinner to appreciate the Pharisee's point of view. The people of England were thus far able, at least, that they realised the venality of their own government. The attitude of the colonists to the mother country as "home",⁽²⁾ their use of the term "independence" for local independence analogous to that enjoyed by Canada after 1848, their discrimination between king and ministers,⁽³⁾ in their loyalty even to George III⁽⁴⁾ - these things might well have served as suggestions and bases for a definition of colonial status progressively acceptable to both members.

Public opinion in the mother country throughout the years of the American question was unsympathetic towards the rights of Britons overseas. It acquiesced in arbitrary action towards

(1) Heatley, op.cit., p.38.

(2) "When an American spoke of going to England,he always called it going home". Witherspoon, "Works", (1804 - 1805) IX, p.169, quoted in Heatley, op.cit., p. 176. Cf. ibid. p.39.

(3) In the early years of the struggle,British troops were not called "royal", but "ministerial".

(4) In 1769, Franklin eulogised George III in conjunction with the obviously very sincere statement of colonial "affection for this nation in general". "Works", V, p.204.

them. There were exceptional features in the situation, features which inclined the balance unduly towards the harsher judgment. Among these the combination of the monarch and the new prerogative party, in support of parliamentarianism - as it seemed, the constitution - on an issue taken by a leading Whig statesman, was foremost. The complete failure of the opposition to give a lead to opinion at large by agreeing to an alternative to coercion, meant that there was no counter current to react upon, to challenge the dominant official propaganda. The achievements of the Seven Years' War, fresh in the nation's mind, furnished too strong a basis for the fomentations of the ubiquitous jingoists. These circumstances together most powerfully influenced the nation's decision, really prejudiced the question. The 'will of all' was spontaneous: 'the general will', it is contended, was not reached.

The most serious charges which posterity can bring against public opinion in this imperial catastrophe seem to be two in number. The public was not informed concerning the situation as it might have been. Information was available: it had not been made use of. This carelessness, this lack of intellectual interest, involving as it did, a general ignorance as to the institutions and culture of the colonists as well as to their material resources, resulted in a more culpable blunder. The Americans were contemned, held socially inferior, counted a

rabble. These faults, the failure to know the facts, and, the tendency to hold the colonists inferior, are not attributable in connection with the American question only. They will be found again in the succeeding period insidious foes of the unity and permanence of the imperial fabric.

While the colonies continued to be regarded as existing only for the commercial advantage of the mother country, the colour and hue of the secondary, would continue to be reflected on the colonists. The mercantile theory has much to answer for. That it set the interests of colonies and mother country in opposition is not the most serious indictment. It estranged their respective peoples. The period in the Empire's history, which follows on the loss of the American colonies, brings juster views of economic inter-relationships. At the same time wiser notions of the political possibilities begin to obtain. The coincidence of commercial concessions on the part of the mother country with her recognition of increased rights of self-government raises the question of the connection of these tendencies as cause and effect. The view that Free Trade brought about the willingness to concede free government to the colonies has been widely accepted. It has, indeed, been suggested, that without the former the latter ^{would} have been impossible. (1)

(1) Cf. Sydney Smith Bell, "Colonial Administration of Great Britain", 1859, p.68.

This rendition of the thought seems an unwarranted deduction from the failure of Britain, while the restrictions of the mercantile system obtained, to find a place within the imperial constitution for the political maturity of her American colonies. It exaggerates what needs no over-estimate — the influence of the economic views of the time on political relations. The following period was to illustrate uniquely how susceptible public opinion was to the all-pervasive, inter-penetrating influence of philosophic and economic theories.

The contribution of this review of public opinion and colonial policy in the Old Empire to the study of their interaction during the succeeding half century lies in the attention it calls to that inter-action — how mis-guided opinion can be when not given a lead by policy, and to what lengths policy could go when not held in check by healthy opinion. The besetting sins of both opinion and policy have been touched on — opinion being prone to attribute inferiority, particularly social inferiority, to colonists, largely because of inadequate information, and policy being tempted to exaggerate the significance of the letter of the law to the sacrifice of its spirit.

The final years of the Old Empire revealed the degree of faith in its outlying communities that was necessary, if such an unsystematic polity as that of Great Britain and her colonies was to escape repeated schisms. Britons overseas, since they could not be ruled to the suppression of their British instincts,

would have to be trusted to pay meet allegiance to British imperial interests. The faith in question would have to be simply the substance of things hoped for; not of things, by niggardly constitutional restrictions, half-realised. It is easy enough looking backward to see how difficult the exercise of confidence in British colonists was. Administration, in those days, had not learned to trust the people at home, let alone the unknown, the wholly-mistrusted accretions of English and other-speaking peoples abroad. That the government of the day should believe in the colonists had not been sufficient. The chasm, "the unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea" had to be bridged. Knowledge, understanding and sympathy were the materials — commerce, emigration and science. Political development at home was necessary that a self-governing Britain might see eye to eye with the self-confident colonies. Time was of the very essence of the solution. While its slow years unrolled, jealous fate was to intervene again with another immensely costly war, to quicken the taxpayer's sensitiveness to the yearly bill of Empire, the seeming opposition of economic interests, the mythical inevitability of separation. Yet out of the war came the necessity of emigration. The colonies became homes from home. At long last, too, the trammels of reaction broken down, a constitutional revolution extended the franchise. Governing themselves, Britons could entrust self- to the Greater Britain overseas.

CHAPTER II.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA. 1783-1793.

"Gross appearances are great realities."

-Eighteenth Century axiom.

The loss of the American colonies was described in the King's speech, at the opening of the session, December 5, 1782, as a great "dismemberment of the Empire". The nation regarded the ruin of its colonial hopes with despair. "The greatest statesmen whom England had produced", says Wraxall, "though they concurred in scarcely any other political opinion, yet agreed on the point, that, with the defalcation of the thirteen colonies from the crown, the glory and greatness of Britain were permanently extinguished⁽¹⁾". Such had been the tenor of Lord Chatham's last pronouncement. The first great exponent of his political views who succeeded to power, regarding the concession of independence as inescapable, concurred that "the sun of England's glory might be said to have set"⁽²⁾. Even earlier than either of these, the Marquis of Rockingham had written, "I believe our meridian is past"⁽³⁾.

(1) Wraxall, op.cit. V, pp.439, 440.

(2) The Earl of Shelburne, July 10, 1782. Parl. Hist. XXIII, 193.

(3) Burke's "Correspondence", II, p.29. Cf. Lewis, "Administrations of Great Britain", p.67, and note.

Lord North's exclamation on receiving the news of Yorktown is familiar to all. "Irreparable ruin", said the Earl of Pembroke. Men in humbler walks of life were equally despondent. Walpole wrote, "We have run to meet the ruin — and it is coming". The periodicals of the year of the peace tell the same story. "A similar sentiment had possessed all classes of men".

England's enemies in Europe were exultant. The prediction of Vergennes, and the aphorism of Turgot contributed to their "I told you so" attitude. So certain was France of her great rival's permanent decay, that during the negotiation of terms of peace she was constrained to lend a helping hand to Britain against her too-successful colonies. The delight of Europe was continental: England was without a friend.

The more thoroughly the internal condition of the country was known, the better reason there seemed to be for such universal despair. The crushing burden of taxation, the utter confusion of the finances, the unprecedented fall in the price of stocks crowded on the mind. Only the keenest of observers would have found signs of great industrial and agricultural

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, p.373.

(2) 27, November, 1781.

(3) Gentleman's Magazine, 1782, 52, p.123; 1783, 53, p.333

(4) Wraxall, op.cit. V, p.440.

(5) 3% Government Stocks went as low as 53 $\frac{7}{8}$ in January, 1784. "---the infallible, inevitable conclusion that follows, is, that the state is bankrupt, and that those who have trusted their All to the public faith, are in very imminent danger of becoming (I die pronouncing it) beggars." John, Earl of Stair, quoted in Sinclair, op.cit., (1803) II, Appendix IV, p.56.

developments impending. And not only was America independent, but Ireland was armed to follow her example, while in India disaster seemed almost as imminent.

It was the loss of the colonies that filled the cup of humiliation. Otherwise conditions had been as bad in the past: in the previous war, defeat had been piled on defeat before Pitt came; now the Empire itself was dismembered permanently. The nation's sense of utter loss is comparable to that of the King of Israel in the cutting off a rebel son. The point is dwelt upon because of its connection with opinion and the later Empire. The bond between Britain and the New World had been something more real than the mercantile system; something more human than a favourable balance of trade. Chatham and Burke had, in great measure, the real will of the nation to support their arguments for conciliation, though the fratricidal conflict was also sanctioned by the will of all. The attachment lingered: the bonds "light as air" were not altogether broken. If an historian may find pathos in human hopes deferred, it is surely to be found in the frequent expression, in the very early years following 1783, of the fond wish that all might be as before. The speech from the throne referred to manifests it. "Religion - language - interest - affection may, and I hope will yet prove a bond of permanent union between the two countries!" Or, - if a formal document such as this is suspect - similar language is to be found in the petition of the Lord

Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London, for the restoration of trade "with our American brethren"; and in the King's reply.⁽¹⁾ So, too, the resolutions on the peace, accepted by public meetings throughout the country put it, as for example that at Epsom, "We sincerely wish that a cordial reconciliation and lasting friendship will be established with America".⁽²⁾ This desire transcended for a time even the conventional views of trade. As will be shown more fully in connection with the economic policy of this decade, the views of the most advanced of the thinkers on fiscal questions found general support in this kindly feeling towards the lost colonies. Public opinion regretted the breach and would have supported a statesman-like effort to repair it.

It does not fall within the province of this study to trace the regrettable growth of an antipathy between England and America. It must be touched on in connection with the public conception of colonials. It certainly grew to something formidable after the tragedy of the next war. It tended to discount the value of Canada, and the attractions of trans-Atlantic emigration. What is here insisted on, is that it did grow: it was not found immediately after the recognition of American independence. The nation's first hope, half in the realisation of its own foolish stubbornness, was that the

(1) Gentleman's Magazine, 1783, 53, p.264. Presented February 26.

(2) Ibid. p.359.

the struggle might quickly be forgotten. Referring to it
 (1)
 was like "tearing open a wound".

The sense of empire was outraged by dismemberment. Self-recrimination aggravated the nation's grief. The amende honorable was willed. Whether her rulers did or not, the people of Britain had learned a lesson. The crass and stupid insistence on sovereignty which Burke deplored was never again strongly exhibited. Higher conceptions of liberty gradually developed. It is a commonplace that "the war of American Independence coloured the whole of the subsequent colonial history of England"
 (2)
 Its reaction on the history of England herself is apt to be overlooked in the somewhat similar, more overpowering influence of the French Revolution. The despair occasioned by the loss of the colonies is the measure of the value attached to them. How great this value was is to be remembered. It bears on the question of the alleged general willingness of two generations later to acquiesce in the severance of all ties with the colonies. Those who had looked for profit from colonial dependencies came to believe that they were not profitable. For them the *raison d'etre* of their retention had gone. But the nation valued them on higher grounds.

(1) Gentleman's Magazine, 53, p.147.

(2) Durham's Report, edited by Sir Charles Lucas, 1912, I, p.104

Reflection tended to lighten the gloom. There was even an element of prestige in being a parent state, though the parting had been in anger. Those who saw in the nation's decline the analogy of the individual life had little comfort. (1) History taught, a great history then just written drove home the idea, of decline and fall following a nation's prime. Others argued the hand of Providence punishing a stiff-necked people: and could hope that in the end the result would be salutary. Historians have, indeed, traced a repercussion on Britain, involving limitations of political liberty as a consequence of the effort to coerce a free people. (2) The more cheerful explanation adopted in some quarters was that the loss was analogous to the pruning of a tree, that like benefit would accrue to the national trunk. (3) The few who in that day had learned to regard mankind as brothers, and national limits as too narrow for their world humanity, were even tempted to rejoice that a new nation had been started (4) on a promising career. But such cosmopolitanism was rare. A still less common tendency to rejoice in the independence of America, was that displayed by a very few individuals who had regarded the colonies as an incubus. Dean Tucker had an

(1) Gentleman's Magazine, 1782, 52, p.123.

(2) Morley, "Burke", (E.M.L.), p.80.

(3) William Backhouse D.D., Rector of Deal, and Arch-deacon of Canterbury, in a sermon delivered July 29, 1784, the General Thanksgiving Day for the Peace.

(4) Cf. Dr. Price's statement, "She is a rising Empire, without bishops, without nobles, without kings". Tucker traces it from Turgot.

extremely limited following in advocating the disadvantage of colonies. In a post-script added to his Seven Letters to
 (1) Necker, having just learned that the colonies were to be independent, the Dean of Gloucester rejoices that Britain is freed from a constant danger through them. He would have France beware of colonial entanglements. "France without colonies or foreign dominions is almost invulnerable; but whenever she is seized with the epidemical madness of having distant colonies, she will be as vulnerable as her neighbours." There were many in Britain, who, after the colonies had been lost in revolution, regretted that Tucker's advice to free them had not been taken.
 (2) That was a very different thing from regarding them as he did, as in their essential nature detrimental to Britain's welfare. The reflection that tended to palliate the national disaster was, in the main, of later development. Time proved the most effective anodyne; time, successful commerce and engrossing war.

At the moment, the colonies were very much in the public mind. The wonder was, how much would be saved from the wreck of Empire. Unofficial peace-makers had various alternatives to submit. Fox was twitted regarding an unfortunate slip as a member of the opposition in which he said that he had a

(1) A pamphlet entitled, "Cui bono?"

(2) Gentleman's Magazine, 1782, 52, p.82. Editorial comment on reviewing Tucker's "Cui bono?"

(1)
 peace in his pocket. Tucker's suggestion calls to mind the mandatory system introduced in the last Peace of Versailles. Four of the thirteen colonies were to be retained by Britain, for a period of ten years, and were then to choose their own form of government. But Parliament, by resolving it would "consider as enemies to His Majesty and to the country all those who should advise, or by any means attempt, the further prosecution of offensive war on the continent of America" had, in the phrase of Thomas Townshend, Secretary of State, put (2)
 "a padlock upon the British sword". American Independence was thus practically pre-determined, the nation, on the whole, (3)
 concurring.

The Rockingham ministry found the negotiation of the treaty sufficiently difficult. The talents of its leader are suggested by Disraeli's epithet "a virtuous magnifico". His Secretaries of State, Shelburne and Fox, proved mutually incompatible; indeed cabinet disunity seems deliberately to have been planned by the King as a punishment of the Whigs for having beaten his system. The military and naval situation called for a Chatham. Without even an approximation to him, however, De Grasse was beaten and Gibraltar saved.

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, p.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIII, p.464.

(3) But cf. "a defence of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Shelburne, etc". This anonymous writer is "well convinced that there is not an individual in the nation with British generosity, British courage, and British ^{feelings} who would not contribute "even his last shirt" to regain those colonies". The reviewer in the Gent's Mag. 53, p.50, disagrees, and is confident that the great majority of the nation repudiates the statement.

Economical reform, meanwhile, allayed the domestic discontent, Pitt assuming the role of a benevolent neutral. The negotiations for peace were not prosecuted "upon narrow-minded principles".⁽¹⁾ But more was asked than could be conceded. For example Franklin asked for Canada. The request was informal, and Shelburne, to whom it was addressed, replied informally with a definite negative. That there was no design on his part to interfere with the legitimate province of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, authorities are now generally agreed.⁽²⁾

A bill, introduced into the Commons from the Lords on the day of Rockingham's death, is a characteristic attempt of the ministry at reform and economy in one.⁽³⁾ This measure would compel persons holding places in the West Indies and America to reside there. The very opposition which it encountered, shows how definitely the House was determined on ending the coercive tendency in colonial policy. It was attacked as assuming the power of appointing officers, and thereby endangering "all amicable settlement of our contest with America." Generally it suggested that "the old system" was still to be pursued. Shelburne's motives were suspected. Fox denied that any hostility was intended. Britain still had colonies, and would continue to have, colonies in America other than those which had revolted. The Secretary

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 464.

(2) Cf. G.C.Lewis, "Administrations", p.42. Cf. J.Holland Rose, "The Life of William Pitt", 1923, Pt.I, p.112.

(3) Parl.Hist. XXIII, 135. Cf. Wraxall, op.cit.II, p.35.

adverted to what had been said "of the necessity the ministry were under of the support and confidence of the people". The next day Fox described himself as pledged to see "that the measures with respect to America were right". Such being his sentiments, it is greatly to be regretted, especially from the point of view of British colonial history, that that was the last occasion for almost a full quarter of a century on which Charles James Fox spoke as Secretary of State. The precipitate action, which severed his connection with the Whigs in office, resulted in his deplorable coalition with North, and his growing away from Pitt. Party tactics, alone, not principles, separated Pitt and Fox. How far the action of the latter contributed to his successful rival's comparative abandonment of the principles they held in common can never be known. Fox was less inclined to recognize "the necessity of changing our plan of commercial relations". But it seems he was more prepared to entrust self-government to the Canadas in 1791; and it is certain that he was at least as warm for the discontinuance of the slave trade.

(1) July 2, 1782. Parl. Hist. XXIII, 138, 139.

(2) Wraxall implies that it was because Fox feared that they wouldn't be "right" that he resigned. Personal jealousy is the motive generally assigned. Cf. Wraxall, op.cit.II,p35ff.

(3) Parl. Hist. XXIII, p. 436; cf. 210, "a revision of our whole trading system upon the same comprehensive principles."

(4) Cf. G.C.Lewis, op.cit. p.131,note.

On January 27, 1783, the preliminary articles of peace with France, and with Spain, and the provisional articles with America were laid before both Houses of Parliament. The unusual attendance three weeks later, when, on the same day, they were formally debated in both⁽¹⁾ Lords and Commons, indicates the interest generally felt in the terms of peace. An analysis of the speeches reveals the fact that it was the third, or American part of the negotiations on which attention chiefly centred. Forts and islands were the current coin of age-old diplomatic bargaining: a continent ceded was unprecedented in the treaties of history. By comparison what was saved of empire seemed the small dust of the balance.

Well might the Duke of Grafton urge that "an empire dismembered demanded peculiar care", and deplore the "idle bickerings", the "factionous motives", the "cabals and parties", which marred "that unanimity which the present period, of all the epochs in the history of this country, most strictly⁽²⁾ claimed". Through the debates on the peace terms shows the outline of the new alignment of parties, "the lofty and strenuous assertors of regal prerogative united in alliance with the humble worshippers of the majesty of the people". The coming coalition was aptly compared to the recent collaboration of Bourbon despots to establish the liberties of America. Shelburne⁽³⁾

(1) "There were in the House at one time of the day 145 peers — a greater number than has been known on any question during the present reign". Parl. Hist. XXIII, 435.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 392.

(3) See implication re character, Franklin's "Works", p. 633.

was to be unseated, though honest men, who could not but distrust him, were compelled to acknowledge the country's indebtedness to him for perseverance and principle manifested in negotiating peace. ⁽¹⁾ Having allowed for party bias, a further discount must be made for rhetoric. It is necessary to sift the speeches to get, what a leading journal calls ⁽²⁾, "the substance of the argument without the declamation".

The opposition maintained that the ministry had ceded too much all round, but particularly to America. To her had been given as boundaries, the Mississippi on the West, and the centre line of the Great Lakes on the North, — a cession of territory which carried with it twenty-five nations of Indians to whom Britain had responsibilities, the fur trade, or the greater part of the fur trade formerly carried on from Montreal, together with all hope of a defensible frontier for what was left to Britain in North America. In addition her nationals had secured extensive fishing privileges on the British North American coast, even in bays and inlets, with the right to land and dry their fish. The best guarantees the administration had to offer the loyalists, who had sacrificed so much for a united empire, was the promise of Congress to enjoin upon thirteen turbulent, but sovereign states, the humane and equitable treatment of the loyalists. The foes of

(1) E.g. see the speech of Mr. Powys, "he had no great predilection for the present First Lord of the Treasury, but ---- he deserved their thanks". Parl. Hist. XXIII, 457.

(2) Gentleman's Magazine, 1783, 53, p.105

the treaty urged the incapacity of "that very extraordinary geographer and politician, Mr. Richard Oswald", the representative of Great Britain in the negotiations, maintaining that he had been "over-matched" at every point. A critic⁽¹⁾ in the Commons asked — since that time there⁽²⁾ has been but too good reason to repeat the query — "Why could not some man from Canada ----- well acquainted with the country, have been thought of for the business?" The opposition brought all its arguments to bear on what it chose to consider the utter irreconcilability of the preamble with the articles which followed. The former proposed principles of reciprocity and equity as the basis for this, as for any, would-be permanent treaty; the latter, with monotonous regularity, recorded⁽³⁾ concessions to America. In short, opponents of the ministry maintained, the only possibility of reconciling the profession of intent in the preamble with the expression of fact in the articles lay in recognising "that reciprocal advantages ---- meant the advantage of one of the parties, and (that) a regulation of boundaries meant a cession of territory."

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 398, 397; cf. 391, "They had been too cunning for us in their negotiation."

(2) Viscount Townshend, *ibid.* 391.

(3) On the other hand, the American Commissioners thought they had given away too much, cf. Franklin, "Works", VIII, IV, pp. 621, 625, 632.

Similarly, with some sound logic and much party zeal, the preliminary articles with France and with Spain were arraigned. Why was St. Lucia restored, and Tobago ceded after a great naval victory in the West Indies? Why, if French privileges in the Newfoundland fishery had to be increased, should she be allowed both the monopoly of the coast fishery from Cape St. John to Cape Ray, and a clear title to the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon including the right to fortify? So in India. So regarding the cession of Florida to Spain. Here, too, it was contended, "The reciprocity was all on one side".⁽¹⁾

The defence was able, though doubtless it had its element of sophistry. The position of England was the first ground taken. Her deplorable state, the victories of Rodney and Eliott notwithstanding, justified what the opposition had termed "these amazing concessions".⁽²⁾ The words of Fox while yet a member of the ministry now served the colleagues he had left as a defence against his new allies. The opposition had cited the Peace of Paris as a criterion. In refutation the argument was turned back on them: France, the government was able to demonstrate, had ceded more in 1763 than England was now about to relinquish. Shelburne took the issue onto a higher plane. In effect he justified the liberal principles of the peace as following strictly from the preamble, maintaining that they

(1) Lord North, Parl. Hist. XXIII, 450.

(2) "The great change of affairs, the reverse of fortune to this country, the state of Europe, and of our own resources". Parl. Hist. XXIII, 138.

were but wisely generous. His conception of commercial economy was much in advance of his day. Pitt and Dr. Adam Smith were to popularise his views. It is possible that both ⁽¹⁾ were his pupils; Pitt certainly was. The liberality which he purposed in a new commercial code, a close approximation of Free Trade, appears in the King's speech at the opening of the session, and was voiced by more than one supporter in the Commons.

Regarding the alleged peril to Britain's cotton manufacture as a consequence of the cession of Tobago, he urged that, by long possession of that great branch of trade, "we can afford to give a greater price for cotton than our neighbours. Cotton therefore, be it in the hands of friend or foe, will always find its way to our door, in preference to that of those who cannot meet it with such a purse". ⁽²⁾ This is cited as an example of the new liberalism, which, associated with the patent truth that a coercive colonial policy based on a narrow constitutionalism did not work, promised better things for the remaining colonies during the early part of the decade. Shelburne's economic proposals will be dealt with in the following chapter.

On the same plane he answered the objections raised to the concessions to America. The territory ceded carried with

(1) Cf. the interesting footnote in Holland Rose, op.cit. ptI, p.183, in which the author states on the authority of Dr. Cunningham that later editions of "The Wealth of Nations" are brought into line with the obvious lessons of Pitt's legislation.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 415.

it much, it was contended, of the fur trade. He showed that the more valuable furs came from farther north, or alternatively, quoting the export figures and the costs of administration for the area in question, he proved that the profit was, indeed, not only negligible but negative. At worst they were sharing a petty monopoly, at best practising an actual economy. Here perhaps, he proved too much. Regarding the Indians, he could not refrain from the sarcastic comment that the noble lords who had made such lavish use of them should know best how to value them. His easy discounting of the binding force of treaties of protection "in perpetuo" savours of the international honour of 1914. Of the fisheries, he claimed that it was simple common sense to concede what the country could not possibly prevent American fishermen from having. The early catch was theirs of geographical right, by the mere logic of immediate proximity.

None of the ministry attempted to defend Article V of the treaty with the United States, other than to assert that it was the best guarantee that could be secured for the loyalists. That the ground given them to hope for treatment, "consistent not only with justice and equity, but with (the) spirit of conciliation", was slight, was tacitly conceded. The inability of the halting Federal Government to bring effective pressure to bear on the individual states was all too apparent. Shelburne's treatment of the matter may have been perfectly

sincere; if so, it is elevated indeed. But it is impossible to read that he has "but one answer to give the House in this particular; it is the answer I give my own bleeding heart. A part must be wounded that the whole of the Empire may not perish," — to read this, as he uses it, without a disconcerting suspicion that action in accordance with such dialectic might well justify the name Malagrida.

Nevertheless he carried the House of Lords with him; "at half-past four in the morning" the address to the King which expressed loyal appreciation of the proposed treaties was carried by a majority of 13. In the Commons three hours later a similar motion was lost by 16 votes. By a majority of 17, resolutions of censure were carried against the administration four days later. The closeness of the figures in these successive divisions in the Commons indicates what part party (1) played even on a question of such imperial moment. And this, in spite of extremely able efforts in the later debate in (2) defence of the peace! Pitt, in particular, did forceful justice to the good points of the proposed terms. American independence was not a concession; it was a fact. Florida was balanced by Providence and the Bahama Islands. In the West Indies, Grenada

(1) Provisional Articles signed Nov. 30, 1782. Art. V. Parl. Hist. XXIII, 354 - 358; cf. Definitive Treaty, *ibid.* 1182-1187.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 543 - 555, especially 549.

Dominica, St. Kitts', Nevis, and Montserrat were regained, for St. Lucia restored and Tobago ceded. Goree, "the grave of our countrymen", was relinquished; healthy Senegambia retained. Regarding Article V he made it unmistakeably clear how little such statements as "we have abandoned the unhappy loyalists to their implacable enemies" were calculated to befriend "those unhappy men". To question the bona fides of Congress was to invite a lax interpretation of its promise.

The public followed the debates with unusual interest. Lord John Cavendish, who proposed the resolutions of censure on the terms of the treaty, indicates this, in part, by his indignant protest at the alleged dishonesty of the report circulated throughout the nation, that those who had opposed the address of thanks to the King were against the peace, while the minority was for it. His distinction was such as George III, on a later occasion, replied to with "None of your Scotch metaphysic, Mr. Dundas!" The people at large, at least the influential part of them, the reading section of the middle class, had a good opportunity of following the discussions, if the care with which they were reported in such periodicals as the Gentleman's Magazine is a safe basis for argument. The substance of the preliminary articles appeared in one number; the articles in full in the following issue, while the definitive treaties were also printed

(1)

when they were available. Wraxall summed up the view of many quoting the speech of Mr. Powys M.P. "There were parts of it which he had wished not to have seen in the treaties; but that nevertheless such was the situation of the country, such the state of our finances, and such the power of the confederation formed against us, that he was ready to accept the peace as it was, and to say it merited the approbation of Parliament".⁽²⁾

(3)

Wraxall's editor notes that the restitutions made in the West Indies by the French Government caused great discontent in France.

The Earl of Shelburne did not delay his resignation. Five months after assuming office, Fox and North, his successors, ratified practically the same treaties as they had so strongly reprobated. Article V with America regarding the loyalists stood word for word as in the provisional draft. The interests of British property-owners in Tobago, and of British merchants concerned in the African gum trade were somewhat more specifically guaranteed. Further, Trincomalee was restored to Holland, although the mere suspicion that the negotiations of the preceding ministry tended in that direction had raised a storm of protest from those who now ratified the

(1) 1783, 53, p.91, 162 ff.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 320, reproduced with approximate accuracy (as compared with Cobbett) in Wraxall, op.cit. II, p. 439.

(3) Wraxall, op.cit. see note p.438, signed D(oran).

cession. The fact that the only modifications effected were to the advantage of merchants indicated how considerable the influence of the interest was. That the coalition failed to secure the inclusion of a commercial agreement in the definitive treaty with America was due to a combination of circumstances. The conflict of interests among British traders, followed closely by the conflict of British and American interests, in part explains this regrettable failure. How much might have been accomplished to implement the more liberal commercial views of an increasing body in the nation had a Whig re-union been achieved, at least a re-union of the followers of Rockingham with those of Chatham, is hinted at by the efforts of Pitt. His independent attempt to secure the enactment of an American Intercourse Bill, though unsuccessful, brought the whole question of the navigation act basis of the colonial system clearly before the public.

Various colonial problems were directly connected with the peace signed with the United States at Versailles, Sept. 3, 1783. Trade relations within the Empire had to be considered anew. Was the ideal of an economically self-sufficient union of the mother country with the remaining colonies still practical? In the following chapter this question will be dealt with for the decade ensuing upon the peace. The question

(1) Cf. Burke's castigation of the Shelburne Ministry's neglect in this particular. Parl. Hist. XXIII, 611. Similarly Fox, *ibid.*, 614. Cf. Franklin's "the reason given us for dropping the article relating to commerce was that some statutes were in the way". "Works", VIII, p.633.

of the treatment to be accorded the distressed refugee loyalists was a particularly complicated one. Many of them in the Metropolis needed help at once. Many more in British North America required grants of land and assistance in the building of new homes. But the Government was compelled to exercise great care to avoid seeming to assume responsibilities properly belonging, from the English point of view, to the government of the United States. At the same time the British authorities with an unanimity that does credit to the age, recognised as a debt of honour their obligation to compensate these unhappy men for the loss of home and country caused by their allegiance to the ideal of a united empire. British opinion, which had not discriminated very carefully between colonials and colonials while the war was in progress, gradually during its later years, and after its conclusion, came to sympathise with the refugees. The plight of the most needy in the purlieus of Soho had early received the attention of Parliament.

Speaking on the subject in the Commons on June 24, 1783, Lord John Cavendish reviewed what had been done for them. He cited the King's Speech of the preceding December, expressing the obligation felt by all, irrespective of party, to deal generously with them. He recounted the disbursements of the commission of the previous year, and moved, successfully, for leave to bring in a bill re-appointing the commissioners, increasing their number and enlarging their powers. He

emphasised the need of describing the Commission as one of inquiry, that there might be no suggestion of a willingness to absolve America from her treaty obligations. Lord North, three days later, carried a motion "allowing half-pay to certain Provincial corps who served with His Majesty's troops during the late war in America"⁽¹⁾. Among others, Pitt protested. His objection was specifically with regard to the mode of affording relief; "every body," he said, "was agreed that the provincial regiments deserved a most grateful return for their services."⁽²⁾ Voting £30,000 without either information or estimate, he characterised as "but a part of the profuse and wasteful system that had characterised the whole of the American War". He recommended that the claims of those who had served should be received and considered by the Commission which was being appointed. The unanimity of public opinion on the whole question of loyalist relief is reflected by the "generous emulation" manifested by party leaders in the House. The conduct of the opposition, a contemporary notes, "reflected on them the highest honour", "remembering the acrimonious terms in which they were accustomed ----- to inveigh against the loyalists".⁽³⁾ This is another indication of the

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 1050.

(2) Ibid. 1056.

(3) Wraxall, op.cit., V, p.136.

higher point of view towards the colonies and colonials. No doubt it was taken, in part, on account of the quickening impulse of philanthropy during the decade. Wra~~x~~all describes the nation's action as "one of the most splendid instances of ---- national sympathy and munificence " on record. (1)

It may appear that able diplomacy would have saved the need of generous relief. The alleged neglect of the negotiators of the peace was not allowed to be forgotten, despite the fact that three administrations had dealt, or had had an opportunity of dealing, with Article V before its ratification. In the debates just quoted, the Secretary at War "reminded the House "that the peace had been condemned by them, principally on "account of the inhumanity of it" with respect to the loyalists, especially the provincial corps. Pitt replied with the definite contention "that everything had been done for that deserving, "but unfortunate set of men that the circumstances of the "moment would allow". The verdict of history has accepted his defence. Professor H.E.Egerton has a valuable word to say (2) regarding the American attitude to the loyalist question, in effect a justification under the circumstances, of the unwillingness to restore to affluence those who had denied the justice of the republican cause, and, by their action, had postponed its success. This recognition is indeed seasonable.

(1) Wra~~x~~all, op.cit., p.135.

(2) "Causes and Character of the American Revolution", p.174.

It has been too long withheld, even by historians in other respects sympathetic with the struggle of the colonists. Still, in the very earliest years after the war, it found some expression in the periodical literature of Britain. Almost in juxtaposition with the report of town meetings in New England, in the Spring of 1783, at which loyalists were voted traitors, and their estates forfeit, the Gentleman's Magazine gives, in the rough and ready fashion in which it circulated, the view of the people of Pennsylvania regarding the general British claim as acknowledged in the treaty. It was, that if the loyalists were American citizens their case was for the consideration of America only; if they were British citizens it was insolent, foolish and absurd to ask favoured treatment for them.

The disbursements of the Commission for the years 1784 to 1789 inclusive were approximately £2,500,000.⁽¹⁾ The assistance which took the form of grants of land in the British North American colonies must be associated with the pecuniary relief given.⁽²⁾ No doubt to some in the post-Napoleonic era, when again the burden of taxes was crushing, and when the value of colonies was being discounted, the cost to the mother country of thus recompensing colonial loyalty must have been added to

(1) Gentleman's Magazine, 53, pt.II, pp.615, 617. See the succinct statement in Holland Rose, op.cit., pp.443 - 445, and footnote p.445.

(2) John, Earl of Stair, "An Argument-----re the State of the Nation", 3rd. ed., 1783, p.18, "But whatever we can afford to give, let us give it in money, and not bewilder ourselves in schemes of colonization, which will cost great sums and end in nothing; as what is given will probably serve only to enrich a few frothy, plausible Projectors, whilst the deserving modest men will receive no benefit from it whatever."

the tale of expenses believed inseparable from a colonial system. But even at that time the candid observer should have seen what a valuable return had been forthcoming already. For one of the great consequences of the settlement of the loyalists in Nova Scotia and the St. Lawrence Valley was that Canada was successfully defended against American aggression in the years 1812 - 1814. Since that time the interest on Britain's generous endowment has been many times compounded and repaid. To a great extent this immigration of expatriated loyalists created the new empire from the very best elements of the old.⁽¹⁾

It is almost impossible to say how many actually entered and settled in what is now Canada. The best authenticated estimates range from 40,000 to 45,000. The abandonment of Boston in 1776 carried the first of their number with the army to Halifax. Burgoyne's defeat, and still more, his failure to specify the just treatment of the loyalists who had aided him, in the articles of capitulation, occasioned the first immigration into Quebec Province. Many of the fugitives were incorporated in the "provincial corps" already referred to. For all, lands were surveyed, and provision made for caring for their women and children.

(1) Egerton, op.cit., p.174, comments on the loss to the United States in this proscription of the conservative elements of her society. Cf. Canadian Archives, 1907, Sessional Paper No. 18, Edited Shortt and Doughty, 2nd. and revised edition in two parts, 1918, p.948.

As Governor of New York, General Carleton was the recipient of numberless petitions for aid. One of these expressed the fear that all the lands in the remaining British colonies would be granted away before the memorialists could enter their claims.⁽¹⁾ An Order in Council, directed to the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, restrained him from making further grants till the loyalists were provided for;⁽²⁾ authority was given to cancel unlocated claims granted prior to 1st. January, 1774. It was to Nova Scotia that the first whole-sale movement was directed. In September 1783, Lieutenant-Governor Parr reported that 13,000 refugees had arrived in that province "during the last three months". Many moved later into the Canadas, some to England, while the blacks among them were, in the main, provided for in the new colony of Sierra Leone. Those who remained in Nova Scotia, perhaps 28,000, were sufficient to double the population.

The mainland, as it has been called, of this colony became New Brunswick. As early as 1784, the rights of the immigrants in self-government were recognised by the establishment of representative institutions. The promptness with which the request of the new-comers was acceded to, is significant of the attitude of the mother country at that time. Liberal tendencies were positive.

(1) Cf. Gentleman's Magazine, 53, pt.II, p.884.

(2) Ibid. p.714.



Cape Breton became a separate province in the same year. At first the settlers had been refused permission to settle in the island. The temptation to manufacture was deemed too great when such mineral wealth was accessible. ⁽¹⁾ Even the loyalists were not immediately afforded homes there. But their need, and the tendency to question the commercial policy which forbade colonial development when it conflicted with the seeming interest of the mother country, soon prevailed to raise the ban. Prince Edward Island, then known as the Island of St. John, during the same years received its quota of loyalists.

The settlement of the loyalists in the St. Lawrence Valley was more gradual than it is often regarded as having been. By 1778, some 200 were being rationed north of Lake St. Peter. By the end of the year in which the peace was definitively concluded they numbered 3000 odd. The Canadian archives record 4,487 in 1786. Most of these had been "incorporated" in provincial corps, and were located according to their military affiliations, in townships, numbered westward from Lake St. Francis. It was thought wise to leave the district adjacent to the boundary, the 45th. parallel of north latitude, unsettled, in order to avoid strife. Nevertheless the upper Richelieu valley retained many of the families of refugees who were

(1) Cf. "The Colonial Policy of Great Britain considered with relation to her North American provinces and West India possessions; etc", by a British Traveller. London and Glasgow, 1816, p.52n., re the unwise reservation to the crown of all mines.

intended to use it merely as an avenue to the St. Lawrence. The "Eastern Townships" became English by their coming. The main settlements in what became Upper Canada were in the vicinity of Kingston, the Bay of Quinte, York and Niagara. The treatment accorded them by the British Government was liberal. ⁽¹⁾ One hundred acres of land were given to each loyalist head of a family who had served as a private, with fifty acres for each member of his family; officers' grants ranged to 5000 acres. Tools, and rations, for three years in most cases, were supplied. In 1788 these extraneous aids to the pioneer life were discontinued, and "the scarce year" took its place in the calendar of hardship. An Order-in-Council of the following November introduced what came to be a cherished distinction — the use of the designation "U. E." loyalists — for those who had attached themselves to the united empire's cause before the conclusion of peace. Many who were of the same stock came even after the division of the provinces, removing from Nova Scotia or migrating directly from the United States.

The attention of Britain was turned to the maritime colonies, and to Canada, by Lord Sheffield's pamphlet in defence of the Navigation Act. ⁽²⁾ He undertakes to demonstrate

(1) Additional instructions to Haldimand, July 16, 1783. Sessional Papers, op.cit. p.730.

(2) "Observations on the Commerce of the American States," new (sixth) edition, 1784.

how easily the wants of the West Indies could be supplied by the northern colonies. Their soil and climate, their forests and fisheries, are described in terms at once more generous and more truthful than were ordinarily used. The pamphlet ran through several editions, and proved particularly effective in its advocacy of the retention of the old commercial system. The views expressed concerning colonial government seem liberal. "They ought to have it according to their wishes"⁽¹⁾. The peculiar merit of the loyalists, it was urged, should be regarded as a strong reason for generosity in this respect. Conciliation should be the mother country's motto. The writer would even permit of the admission of Roman Catholics to the colonial legislatures.⁽²⁾ But the freedom thus championed is freedom within the mercantile fold. Emigration from Britain is discountenanced. The colonies are looked to to blossom and flourish, to supply the West Indies in Britain's interest, but to refrain from building ships of more than fifty or sixty tons!

The most important colonial question of the decade following the loss of the American colonies, is that of the Government of Canada.⁽³⁾ The settlement of the loyalists rendered the

(1) Sheffield, op.cit., p.177, The writer had no doubts on the score of the permanent retention of the colonies. His view was — as long as we make their situation eligible they will remain dependent. p. 179.

(2) Ibid., p. 178, note.

(3) correctly speaking, Quebec.

need for a reconsideration of the form of government the more imperative. Even without their advent the necessity of action had asserted itself. As it was, eight years elapsed before the Quebec Act was transcended by the enactment of 1791. To eager contemporaries the action of the Pitt administration must have seemed reprehensibly slow: in the light of subsequent history the time taken is proved to have been well spent. Critics of the solution, at length arrived at, have not hesitated to suggest ulterior motives in principle and in detail. The indictment is not substantiated. The history of the Constitutional Act, as revealed in the official communications between successive Home Secretaries and successive Governors of Quebec, is the history of an attempt to apply the lessons of recent colonial experience to the end of good government in a peculiarly situated colony. The record of the debates in Parliament supports this reading of the interchanges referred to. True, the House of Commons in 1791 contained many whose conceptions of political liberty soared above the limits set to Canadian self-government. Still more patent is it that the Act proved hopelessly obsolete long before it, in turn, was superseded. By that time, the greatest of modern revolutions had scattered widely those ideas of freedom under the law which gradually worked a revolution in England itself. Not only will it be shown that these eight years witnessed a statesman-like effort to deal liberally, and yet safely with

(1)

the Canadian question, but also an unexpected effort to hold the balance true between the powerful mercantile interest and the half-articulate mass of the French-Canadians. The Government which, in the second^{last} decade of the eighteenth century, could hew to the line in this fashion, deserves some defence against the charge of planning to withhold what it seemed to give. Pitt probably realised much more fully than his critics how truly he could describe the problem as "one of the most delicate and important that ever called for the attention of Parliament".

The roots of the difficulty reach back to a period prior to the Quebec Act. By a proclamation of October 7, 1763, an assembly was promised to the people of the colony. It was agitated for by a handful⁽²⁾ of British merchants almost from that moment.⁽³⁾ Sir Guy Carleton's views of the situation found expression to very considerable extent in the Quebec Act. That measure, introduced as it was by the ministry of Lord North, associated as it was with the penal acts of the year 1774, must be regarded either as a unique example of generous statesmanship or as a remarkably astute piece of legislation. Tona

(1) The constitution of 1791 is commonly described as illiberal, implying a comparison with the self-government which had grown up in the American colonies. In the mean-time, the question of parliamentary sovereignty had been raised, and the situation been entirely altered. A more relevant test of the liberality with which Canada was treated would be a comparison with the government extended to Nova Scotia in 1758.

(2) By 1774, the English-speaking and Protestant population numbered 360; the French were at least 80,000.

(3) Cf. Carleton to Shelburne, 20 Jan., 1768, Sess. Papers op.cit. p.295, regarding the disgruntled inn-keeper who "with three or four more ---- are at work again for an assembly".

great extent it may be said to have saved Canada,⁽¹⁾ It aroused much, though fleeting, opposition in England.⁽²⁾ The very wide freedom it accorded to Roman Catholicism, renewed by the Act of 1791,⁽³⁾ was to continue to arouse opposition for years to come. To the French Canadian it was a veritable Magna Charta. The Peace of Versailles was barely signed, there had not been time for the news of its definite conclusion to reach the St. Lawrence, when the agitation of the English and (or) commercial element in the colony for a house of Assembly was renewed.⁽⁴⁾

The petition of the next year⁽⁵⁾ is better known. It was supported at the Bar of the House of Commons by Mr. Adam Lymburner, the agent of the petitioners. That was four years after it had been drawn up. Within the first week its opponents in the province had signed a counter-petition,⁽⁶⁾ which dealt, clause by clause, with the fourteen requests made by the merchants. The chief prayer of the British element was for a "Free, Elective House of Assembly". The chief ground on which it was

(1) Memorial of British Merchants, 8, February, 1786, Sess. Papers, op.cit., p.798, on the other hand describes the Quebec Act as "one of the causes of the defection of the neighbouring colonies". Wedderburn ("Cavendish Debates", p.57,) "It is one object to this measure that these persons (English subjects) should not settle in Canada".

(2) Walpole, op.cit. I, pp. 376, 380.

(3) Cf. Edinburgh Review, April, 1808, vol. 12, p.216.

(4) Halkimand to North, 6 Nov., 1783. Sess. Papers, op.cit p. 738, referring to petition signed 30 Sept. 1783.

(5) Petition for House of Assembly, Nov. 24, 1784, Sess. Papers, op.cit. p. 742.

(6) Objections to the petition of Nov., 1784. Sess. Papers op.cit., p. 754.

urged was that careful attention to the local needs of the province required local taxing powers. The option of trial by jury in all courts of original jurisdiction was asked. It was suggested "that the ancient Laws and Customs of this Country, respecting landed Estates, Marriage Settlements, Inheritances and Dowers, be continued", but that the commercial laws of England be introduced. The subscribers of the counter-petition pleaded the poverty of the colony as an objection both to costly jury trials in civil cases, and to an assembly contended for as a means of relieving the mother land of expense. That an assembly was "une machine anglaise pour nous taxer" quickly became rooted in the minds of the habitants.

The petition of the merchants of November 1784, and the French counter petition were only two of a number of representations carried by agents, or forwarded by the Governor, to the British authorities. The interest and the influence of the trading element gave the arguments for the repeal of the Quebec Act, and the concession of a free constitution much greater publicity than was gained by the counter argument of the "new subjects". "The rights of Englishmen" became the slogan of the opposition. The House of Commons was said to have no knowledge of the other side of the case: ministers were challenged to produce the counter petitions. Pitt refused to be stampeded into precipitate action. In 1786, information was lacking. Sir Guy Carleton was raised to the peerage as

Lord Dorchester, and sent, with a commission which embraced under his executive, Quebec, Nova Scotia including the islands of Saint John and Cape Breton, New Brunswick and "all Our Territories respectively dependant thereupon", to learn the exact situation. Again, in 1788, Pitt declined to pledge the government to action: until he was convinced that the best measure possible had been drafted, he was determined to bring in no bill. The King's illness again postponed the question. Fox raised it once more on March 8, 1790. Grenville, whose speech on that date, and again at the end of the month, manifests how much thought he was giving to the problem, apologised for the delay. Pitt still maintained that it was "their duty to render that plan as perfect as the nature of the case would permit". It was not until February 25, 1791, that the King's message announced the two main features of the proposed bill to the House — a division of the province, and a provision of lands for the support of the Protestant Clergy.

There seems to be no reason to assign any other cause for the delay than that given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There was no popular demand to spur the ministry on, however. Mr. Powys, who had presented the petition of November 1784, on behalf, as the document claimed, of the "ancient and new subjects, inhabitants of the province of Quebec", and who resumed the discussion in 1788, said on the latter occasion

that he well knew the subject "was not likely to engage the general attention of the House". The opposition raised no serious objection to the second reading of the bill. It was not until seven firms engaged in the Canada trade employed Lymburner to draw up a petition ⁽¹⁾ against it that real opposition arose. Then the re-commitment of the bill was demanded.

The policy finally implemented in the Constitutional Act of 1791, was deliberate, a conscious shaping of means to end, with an eye to the broader issues. This statement might be made of the Quebec Act. It would be made with a decided difference. Regarding the latter there remains something unexplained, a suggestion of a motive not confessed. The success of its admitted generosity hardly justifies its ⁽²⁾ ungenerous implications. The weak insinuation that Pitt, in the Constitutional Act aimed to apply the principle "divide and rule" might seem to put both pieces of legislation on the same footing. The half-charge is without the substantiation of circumstances which supports the suspicion of North's measure. Pitt was not in the same year abrogating the constitutional rights of an adjacent colony, closing a leading

(1) dated London, March 15, 1791. See Holland Rose, "Pitt and Napoleon Miscellanies" for text.

(2) Cf. Burke, "a measure dealt out by this country in its anger under the impulse of a passion that ill-suited the purposes of wise legislation".

(1)

port, and enacting the transportation of prisoners for trial. Indeed so unfounded is the criticism that the ministry, in the case of the division of the colony, feared greatly that they were endangering their hold on the upper province, rather than were confident that both would be more firmly held. Then, and for years after, the influence of the Americans was dreaded as inimical to British interests in Upper Canada. The division was made hesitatingly lest it should facilitate the annexation of the English portion of the St. Lawrence valley by the adjoining Republic.

(2)

Both acts were protracted in the making. But in the second instance there is proof which is lacking in the first that responsible ministers were seriously grappling with the complexities of the problem. The communications of an able governor were not allowed a second time to accumulate unread, to be sorted out for examination when a bill was being framed. Colonial papers had acquired a new importance: it would ill have become Pitt's Home Secretary wholly to have neglected what might, it had been proved, be of great pith and moment. Even in that the lesson of experience is manifest.

(1) 14 Geo. III cc. 45, 19, 39 respectively.

(2) Sessional Paper, op.cit., pp. 948,987.

The effort to profit by the disaster of 1783 was consistent.
 (1)
 What may be found narrow, illiberal, or even reactionary in the constitution granted by Pitt, must find much justification in this endeavour. The views of the day were so permeated by respect for the constitution "as by law established", the reaction of republican excesses, social perhaps quite as largely as political, on the mind of the governing classes in Britain so strongly reinforced that traditional reverence for "a mixed government", the new democracy in the West had paid such a striking tribute to that constitution as they understood it, that it would have been surprising in the extreme if, in 1791, British legislators could have done other than repress the popular element in the constitution they were granting. The official view of the American question need not be endorsed to concede that it was honest. The enactment to which that official view gave direction and substance need not be applauded to recognise that it was framed to avoid the blunders of the past

Colonial policy in this connection was largely influenced by "the man on the spot", Sir Guy Carleton. In that, though a relapse to government from Downing Street occurred later, is

(1) That a degree of liberality was intended is indicated by the letter of Grenville to Dorchester, Oct. 20, 1789, Sess. Paper, op.cit., p. 969. "I am persuaded that it is a point of true Policy to make these Concessions at a time when they may be received as a matter of favour, and when it is Our own power to regulate and direct the manner of applying them, rather than to wait 'till they shall be extorted from Us by a necessity which shall neither leave Us any discretion in the form, nor any merit in the substance of what We give". Cf. May, "Constitutional History of England", (ed. F.Holland), 1912, p.363. The Constitutional Act "marked the continued adherence of Parliament to the principles of self-government."

some indication of ministers' having profited by dear experience. To develop that idea in full, the first step might properly be to show how much Carleton, who was wisely taken as their guide and confidant, had himself learned the lessons of the past. In one of his early ⁽¹⁾ despatches he writes in praise of the modified feudal system of the French in Canada, in particular of the traditional tenure of lands 'en seigneurie', very seriously deprecating the establishment by recent proclamation ⁽²⁾ of the freehold system. The French gradations of landlord and habitant had "established Subordination, from the first to the lowest, which preserved the internal Harmony ----- and secured Obedience". That such civil discipline should appeal to the soldier is but natural. He was heard. Almost by return, the ⁽³⁾ Earl of Hillsborough wrote of measures "to correct this original and fatal mistake" of setting aside French laws and customs. Instructions authorising the restoration of "the ancient mode of granting Lands" were forthcoming in 1771. Twenty years later Lord Dorchester expressed different views. In direct opposition to his recommendation given above he now wrote, "I therefore humbly recommend that His Majesty would be graciously pleased to allow His Governor and Council to grant His Lands in free and common soccage, unencumbered with any crown ⁽⁴⁾ rent whatever". Dorchester acknowledged the logic of events.

(1) Carleton to Shelburne, 24 Dec. 1767. Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.288ff.

(2) October 7, 1763, *ibid.*, pp. 163 - 168.

(3) Hillsborough to Carleton, March 6, 1768, Sess. Papers op.cit., p. 297, cf. p. 423.

(4) Dorchester to Sydney, June 13, 1787, *ibid.*, p. 946.

The freehold system was a concession to the increasing British element, largely loyalist. But it was more than that. It was a concession by a soldier become statesman, to political liberty. The complexity of the Canadian situation, seen through the experiences of the American War, was not to be met by the autocratic retention of mere "Subordination". Dorchester in the same despatch confessed himself "as yet at a loss for any plan likely to give satisfaction to a people so circumstanced". An assembly was increasingly demanded. British institutions, he felt, were coming. Lands in common soccag^e he urges at once, that the introduction of these institutions may be gradual. The governor's very uncertainty, coupled as it is with words which indicate a mind actively engaged with the problem, makes an advance on the old policy of easy-going indifference punctuated with high-handed enactments.

The Governor-in-Chief came to see the advisability of conciliation all round: or rather something still better calculated to preserve amicable relations between mother country and colonies, the exercise of scrupulous care to prevent the development of grievances. For example he cites, as a potential grievance, the collection of "the thirty pence for every hundred acres" in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In the old colonies, government, he understands, had never been able to collect quit-rents⁽¹⁾ though they were almost nominal. In the remaining colonies, he recommends their

(1) Ibid., p. 948.

absolute remission "to all who do not hold more than one thousand acres". And this is but a particular under the general policy he advocates, in such language as, "I judge it highly expedient to remove the Smallest Cause of discord between the King's Government and His people, or between Great Britain and these Provinces, on any score whatsoever".

The Governor-General was sufficiently definite in his written despatches regarding his own effort to be guided by the lessons of the past. The ministry, which reflected his views to considerable extent, went even farther both in formal statement and in corresponding action. The official determination to profit by experience is stated in concluding a summary of the facts of the Canadian situation as they were regarded in the Home Secretary's office. ⁽¹⁾ The petition of November 1784 for a House of Assembly, and the counter petition of the general body of Canadians, are examined point by point with no little acuteness. Regarding an Assembly, the précis - writer sees that the real objections are "the apprehension which the Seigneurs entertain of losing the privileges, & distinctions of their Seigneuries ----- and a fear on the part of the Canadians, in general, of being subject to the payment of Taxes -----". But since Britain cannot continue to defray the increasing costs of administration, it is held

(1) "Discussion of Petitions and Counter Petitions re Change of Government in Canada", Sessional Paper, op.cit., pp. 970 - 987, enclosed by Grenville to Dorchester with his (Private and Secret) of Oct. 20, 1789. See Appendix I for excerpt.

safe to infer that the Canadians, since they must contribute, would prefer to exercise some control over such taxation. The paper continues, "It does not seem that this point has ever been fairly stated to them". The noblesse, on the other hand, entertain "a just & reasonable apprehension" of "injury to their peculiar rights", mistrusting the establishment of a popular assembly. Steps should be taken to prevent an undue
(1)
preponderance against the seigneurs.

Regarding the constitution of the Council, it was evidently the view of the petitioners that an identity should obtain, as in the old Colonial Governments, between "the Upper House of the Legislature and the Executive Council". To this the official mind strongly objects. The second branch of the Legislature was, "of all others, the point in which they (the Colonial Governments) were most defective." "The aristocratical part of our Constitution was but ill supplied" in them. "To the want of an intermediate Power, to operate as a check, both on the misconduct of Governors & on the democratical Spirit which prevailed in the Assemblies, the defection of the American Provinces, may perhaps be more justly ascribed, than to any other general cause which may be assigned." To correct this error in the constitution to be given Canada, "a respectable Aristocracy as a support, & safeguard to the

(1) The Canadian gentry, though they styled themselves "the great Proprietors of the nation", were not, however, over estimated as compared with the mass of the habitants. Cf. Sess. paper, op. cit., pp. 962 note, 971.

Monarchy" should be created. For this the Constitutional Act
 (1)
 made provision: the clauses were permissive and remained dead
 letters.

Similarly the official résumé deals with the other requests
 of the British petitioners. It manifests an inclination to
 agree rather with the reply of the counter petition than with
 the corresponding demand. In particular, the eighth, ninth and
 tenth articles are found unconstitutional — the election of
 sheriffs by the assembly, and the restraint of the governor
 "from suspending any Officer of the Crown, or from creating new
 Offices without the Consent & advice of the Council".

Dealing with the last article, that which requested the
 repeal of the Quebec Act, the official view of Canada as a
 colony, and of the steps by which it might be kept in that
 relation, is strongly developed. (2) A very fundamental doubt is
 first suggested, whether there is not some essential weakness
 in the bond between the mother country and "so great and distant
 a dominion", from which ultimate separation must inevitably
 follow. This early official recognition of the great uncertainty
 of the following century in colonial policy is deserving of
 particular attention. So much of the administration of the
 colonies was "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought"
 such as this, as to bespeak a special importance for this

(1) 36 Geo. III c. 31, VI - X inc.

(2) See appendix I. p.405.

striking formal expression. So much of the unwillingness to abandon an obsolete colonial system enwrought with an equally antiquated commercial policy was due to the haste to exploit the colonies while they were colonies. Were they not to ripen and drop off as certainly as the constantly-quoted fruit? For the time being the official who drafted the paper in question claimed to exercise Appolyon, to put the thought behind him, maintaining that,

"The real question now to be decided is, what system is best calculated to remove this event to a distant period & to render the connection, in the interval, advantageous to the Mother Country without oppression or injury to the Colony?"

The writer continues that to this end it is "certainly very material to examine the constitution of our former Colonies". Doing so he finds that they never had the British Constitution, no care having been taken "to preserve a due mixture of the Monarchical & Aristocratical parts",. Having already dealt with the weakness of the second branch of the legislature in the old colonies, and suggested "some mark of honour, such as a Provincial Baronetage", to supply the defect in Canada, he turns to provide for the lack of prestige enjoyed by the executive. The old colonies still point the moral. ⁽¹⁾ Something had already been done to enhance the position of the King's representative in the remaining colonies. The different governments had been consolidated under Lord Dorchester as Captain General and

(1) See appendix I. p. 405.

(1)
 Governor in Chief. In him was vested the supreme civil and military power for British North America. In point of consideration and emolument nothing was lacking. No diminution of dignity or weight to the executive seemed likely to arise in future from the office being improperly filled. Here, too, are suggested various means of increasing the number of people in the colony, in addition to those for whom hereditary titles were designed, whose conservative leanings would counterbalance the democratic tendency of the masses. The establishment of a militia with berths for the noblesse was one. The consecration of the Bishop of Nova Scotia in 1787 was a step in this direction which had been taken: the provision for the support of all Protestant clergy in Canada was carefully planned. Lord Dorchester had indicated the possibility of increasing the rewards within the gift of the crown by making reservations of land in proportion to the grants made. The home authorities found, they thought, a better idea in this hint. By a careful

(1) Instructions to Lord Dorchester, Aug. 23, 1786, Sess. Paper, op.cit., p. 826 ff., cf. note 2, As General Officer Commanding H. M. Forces, even Newfoundland was added to his command.

(2) Cf. Carleton to Shelburne, Jan. 20, 1768. Sess. Paper op.cit., p.296. "It may not be improper here to observe, that the British Form of Government, never will produce the same Fruits as at Home, chiefly because it is impossible for the Dignity of the Throne, or Peerage to be represented in the American forest."

(3) This is now definitely recognised as Grenville's idea. See Holland Rose, "Life of Pitt", pt. I, p.449, and note.

(4) Additional Instructions to Haldimand, July 16, 1783, Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.730, ff. The first suggestion of clergy reserves appears here. A glebe of 300-500 acres was to be set aside in every Seigneurie laid out for loyalists.

(5) See next page.

adoption of the principle of Crown Reserves, an increasing fund for defraying the costs of administration would be provided. It might be expected to grow 'pari passu' with the expenses of the growing colony. Such a provision for the civil list would supply a defect in colonial government only too seriously revealed in the former colonies.⁽¹⁾ The enactment of the Imperial Legislature, which required holders of places in the colonies to reside there, had already done something to swell the numbers of those whose interest bound them to the support of government.

It should be evident that the ministry framing the Constitutional Act professed to be guided by experience. The paper which has just been reviewed entertained one other alternative to establishing a free constitution. It was envisaged to be disregarded at once; but it was from experience the suggestion came. Briefly it was that no concessions whatever should be made; that, since the very establishment of a local legislature in a distant province seems naturally to prepare the way for separation, none should be established. Unfortunately for the possibility of carrying out such an arbitrary policy, the Declaratory Act of 1778 prevented Britain from directly levying taxes. The Quebec Act prevented the Governor and Council from doing so. There was

(5) Dorchester to Sydney, June 13, 1787, Sess. Papers, op.cit. p.948, states that "people of property in the states are now sensible of the evils occasioned" by a "consideration of things which tends to a wild Democracy". Cf. Paley, "The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy", 2 vols. 1814, II, p.232.

(1) Grenville to Dorchester, Oct. 20, 1789. Sess. Papers, op.cit., p.969. "A measure which, if it had been adopted when the Old Colonies were first settled, would have retained them to this hour in obedience and Loyalty".

no escape from the dilemma: Britain must continue her bounty or allow self-taxing rights to Canadians. To suggest that no constitution should be given was perhaps the most logical conclusion from the lesson of the lost colonies a British statesman ever drew. That it was formally stated, even to be rejected at once, shows again what an object lesson was being made of the American catastrophe.

Opinion played a large part in the determination of the policy to be adopted towards Canada. This is not in contradiction of statements above⁽¹⁾ regarding the lack of interest in the Constitutional Act of 1791. As ever, a distinction must be made between determining and directing policy. There was even a suggestion of direction. The influence of the Church interest, if the expression be allowable, created a current of opinion which had its effect. And the mercantile interest similarly contributed something to the definite shaping of policy. Both of these influences will be treated in what follows. Opinion determined broadly, in at least two distinct respects, the constitutional policy of the decade.

In the first place, opinion determined the careful attempt which was made to give Canada a more exact copy of the British Constitution. That Upper Canada's first Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Graves Simcoe, was able to describe the form of Government enacted for the Canadas "as the very image and transcript"

(1) pp. 59, 60.

of government at home, was due to the all but universal belief in the unique virtues of the constitution "as by law established." Praised by foreigners, greatest and least, copied by colonists become independent, extolled by historians as the gift of the ages, the British constitution was regarded by the vast majority from king to commoner as possessed of unequalled "beauty, excellence and perfection".⁽¹⁾ This unquestioning faith found much to justify it as the years following the loss of the colonies passed. The prestige British institutions had lost was soon regained. The view of the severance which has just been outlined, that the disruption was a consequence of the colonies not having had a "mixed government", completely justified the constitution as it was known in Britain. Again the comparison which could be made by any of the middle classes, in the later eighties, of the irretrievable disaster in which Britain seemed involved in 1783 with her position such a short time after - stocks up, debt reduced, credit revived - must have restored any temporary diminution of national self-complacency. The county associations hardly outlasted 1784.⁽²⁾ The next year Pitt's

(1) George III to North, Nov. 14, 1778, Donne, op.cit., II, p.214. Generally, Hume, Blackstone, Burke, Paley; equally strongly in the magazine literature of the day, e.g. the prefaces to successive yearly volumes of the Gents. Mag. 1791, 1792, 1794, and in particular the introduction, by John Nichols F.S.A., to the General Index 1737 - 1818. So in the pamphlet literature, e.g. "Letters to the Earl of Liverpool on the State of the Colonies", by an M.P. "For of our constitution we are so proud that we are most injudiciously eager to force it upon others, whether they desire it, or are qualified to receive it, or not" p.5. Cf. Leslie Stephen, "English Utilitarians", I, p.18; A.V.Dicey, "Law and Public Opinion in England", pp.72, 73.

(2) Holland Rose, "Life of Pitt", pt.I, p.21.

effort for parliamentary reform met with no general support. The results in legislation being satisfactory, the nation acquiesced in anomalies in representation. By "the rights of Englishmen", even the opposition in Parliament meant rights such as the constitution of that day conferred. Certainly Quebec merchants used it for nothing more. Guided by the failure of a travesty of the constitution in the old colonies, supported by the unshaken faith of Britons in the constitution as it then was, Pitt's ministry endeavoured to adapt it with a very considerable degree of generosity to the local conditions in Canada.

It may be asked if the Act of 31 Geo. III did not give Canada a form of government which was itself the greatest travesty of the British constitution. The executive was not responsible to the majority of the people's elected representatives. Two answers are at once and equally offered. First, to give such responsible government was not deemed in keeping with the status of a colonial legislature. ⁽¹⁾ Second, to give such responsible government ^{would} have been, in no unfair sense of the word, to transcend the government then existing in the mother country. It might further be contended that there was very little criticism of the Act of 1791 on this score, that it was received in Canada as granting the rights of government enjoyed in Britain, and that it took years to bring out its inherent defects.

(1) See appendix I. p.405.

The voices raised against the Act were those of the mercantile interest. Instigated by the protest⁽¹⁾ of the merchants, the opposition indulged in protracted criticism, but missed the one serious objection which time was to reveal. They were divided. Burke defended the bill: the debate became a field day for constitutional theorists. Fox had been described as a champion of republican principles, and certainly in earlier debates had supported generosity as the true policy towards Canada. He had said, "I am convinced that the only means of retaining distant colonies with advantage is to enable them to govern themselves"⁽²⁾. The quarrel with Burke intervened to prevent really constructive criticism of the measure. The division of the province, to which the merchants expressed the strongest objection, was regarded by the ministry as the essential feature of the bill. Of course it stood. Hereditary Legislative Councillors were never appointed: but probably Lord Dorchester's objections counted for more than those of the petitioners. Points gained by the latter were an increase in the number of assemblymen in the lower province, and the reduction of the term of the assemblies in both to four years.

On the whole the influence of the mercantile interest, directly and through the opinion it called into being, was

(1) Petition drawn up by Lymburner, presented by Mr. Hussey M.P. April 8, 1791. Cf. Parl. Hist. XXIX, 105.

(2) And again, "Canada must be preserved to Britain by the choice of its inhabitants". Ibid., 110.

considerably less than might have been expected. It might easily be contended that therein the colonial policy of the period finds no inconsiderable credit. Certainly the more liberal tendencies of the era made against concessions to what had unfortunately come to be regarded as a faction. Lieutenant-Governor Hope described the petition of November, 1784, the most effective of the Canadian merchants' endeavors, as actuated "by a spirit of Party and faction fomented by various interests and resentments"⁽¹⁾. By agitation which plainly evinced a desire to secure selfish advantages, the trading classes distracted attention from their just grievances. The Act of 1791 contains but one section regarding the administration of justice. Such a simple and obvious need as registry offices for deeds and mortgages was not met until the time of Lord Durham.

The influence of the body of opinion in Britain which was concerned for the interests of the Established Church was more effective. From the earliest days it had been the custom to instruct governors to cherish the interests of the Church.⁽²⁾ Directions were given regarding the care to be tendered Labrador missionaries.⁽³⁾ The attitude of the bishops to the

(1) Hope to Sydney, Nov. 2, 1785. Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.794.

(2) Cf. Hillsborough to Carleton, Oct. 12, 1768, Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.325.

(3) Instructions to Lord Dorchester, Aug. 23, 1786. Sess. Paper, op.cit. p.816ff. section 38.

Quebec bill — they supported it — was explained by Horace Walpole as the result, first, of their desire not to offend the court party while the thirty-nine articles were under discussion, and second, because they still hoped for the establishment of Episcopacy in the American colonies.⁽¹⁾ There were many of the lower clergy and laymen then, and later, to question the wisdom of an act which tolerated the State Church while it all but established Roman Catholicism. Not a few were inclined to argue that an American Episcopacy had tended to hold the colonists to their allegiance.⁽²⁾ The first instructions regarding the allotment of lands to the loyalists provided for a glebe in each seigniory.⁽³⁾ The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was widely and influentially supported. In a sermon before this society, the Bishop of Oxford⁽⁴⁾ drew attention to the condition of the Church in Nova Scotia. A bishop was greatly needed. In reviewing the pamphlet which gave the discourse a much wider influence, the Gentleman's Magazine enforced the argument, contending for at least equal support for the Church of England in the remaining colonies as was accorded

(1) "Last Journals", I, p.376 ff.

(2) "Letters to the Earl of Liverpool", 1821, op.cit., pp. 47, 48.

(3) Additional Instructions to Haldimand, July 16, 1783. Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.730ff.

(4) Dr. Butler, Friday, Feb. 20, 1784; see review in Gentleman's Magazine, vol.54, pt.I, p.447. The society was in receipt of large benefactions.

the Church of Rome. It has been indicated that Bishop Inglis, a loyalist clergyman from New York, was consecrated shortly after as a result of this and similar agitation. Seven sections in the Constitutional Act provided for the setting aside of a fixed proportion of future grants of crown lands for the support of a Protestant clergy. The collection of tithes was not disallowed. So that it seemed that very ample provision, indeed, had been made for the clergy of the Church of England.⁽¹⁾ So generous was it, that Fox made these concessions the ground of his strongest criticism of the bill; and, at that, he interpreted "the Protestant clergy" to include all Protestant denominations.⁽²⁾ The Act placed the Canadas under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Bishop of Nova Scotia.⁽³⁾ In two years time

(1) The more definite "Church of England" was used regarding rectories in following clauses. Cf. 31 Geo. III c.31, clauses XXXVI - XLII. Cf. Simcoe to Dundas, dated from Niagara, Nov. 6, 1792, for the strongly expressed view of the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada regarding the imperative need of implementing these clauses. The colonists were drawn to various nonconformist bodies, yet they were too poor to pay many clergymen. The Church had both independent means and legal endowment. If it tendered its services, it would be accepted gratefully - and, by many, permanently. Pellew, "Life of Sidmouth", 3 vols. 1847, I, pp. 92 - 93. The biographer bemoaned the neglect of such advice.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIX, 105 ff.

(3) 31 Geo. III c.31, clause XL.

the Bishopric of Quebec was created, and, shortly after, the building of a Metropolitan Church in that capital was commenced. (1) The influence of the Church in this piece of legislation is in keeping with the evangelical movement and with the general humanitarian awakening, which, at this time, was formulating a public opinion destined to prove unexpectedly effective in determining the administration of the Empire.

Finally, with regard to colonial policy towards Canada, it might be shown that the somewhat more liberal tendencies which actuated the decade, resulting from and reacting on public opinion, were borne out in numberless little conciliatory utterances and actions. The modesty of the loyalists in asking only for their lands on freehold, rather than on (2) seignorial, tenure, increased the kindly attitude towards them. Their silence was credited to them. Similarly the numbers and

(1) A letter to Lord Sydney from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, quoted from the Sessional Paper, op. cit., p.1030 note, shows how directly its influence was brought to bear on Government. "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, having under their consideration the state of their missions in North America, and of the Church of England, in such parts of it as remain under the dominion of His Majesty, are anxious to be informed what steps have been taken by Government since the last peace towards forming a church establishment therein, and making a permanent provision for its ministers". Having noted the instructions re glebes in New Brunswick, and proposals in Nova Scotia and Quebec, the letter continues to inquire, "how far the Governors have complied with these instructions", and so on, very definitely. Knox's "Extra Official State Papers", etc. vol I, Appendix No. IV.

(2) Petition of the Western Loyalists, Sess. Papers, op. cit p.949, asked generally for British institutions. Government had meanwhile inferred that their wish would be such, though it was not indicated in the Petition of Sir John Johnson on their behalf. Cf. ibid., pp.773, 973.

passivity of the main body of the French Canadians was weighed and valued, as against the clamour, relatively speaking, of both merchants and seigneurs. The ministry aimed at increasing the aristocratical element under the constitution; but it went about it in a modern, rather democratic manner. A semi-official letter records that,

"The great question, whether a House of Assembly would contribute to the welfare of this Province in its present state? has been so fully discussed that the subject is entirely exhausted — both old and new subjects here, who have openly declared their sentiments, now composedly wait the decision of the British Parliament with respect to Canadian affairs.

"It was, in my humble opinion, a wise measure to endeavour to draw from every quarter as much information as could possibly be had — there had been no restraint on the people — they have said all they had to say".(1)

On the day on which Burke attacked Fox for his republican principles, he maintained that "the ancient Canadians, being the most numerous, were entitled to the greatest consideration".(2)

Dorchester's later views might be summed up by saying that he would have the condition of the Canadians made in every respect "equally eligible" with that of the Americans in government. Pitt admitted that they ought to be governed to their satisfaction.⁽³⁾

(1) Finlay to Nepean, (Deputy Postmaster-General to first permanent Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), Feb. 9, 1789. Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.960.

(2) Parl. Hist. XXIX, 366.

(3) Ibid., 113, So also Lord Sheffield, "Observations on American Commerce", 6th. edition, 1784. p.177.

To conciliate was the watchword of the ten years, as colonial policy is viewed constitutionally. To draw profit from the late tragedy of empire was the method pursued. To adapt the British Constitution to the purposes of colonial government was a policy consciously, painstakingly followed. All of these had the support of public opinion. That it was wise to grant to Englishmen overseas the rights of Englishmen was a thought to which expression was at first frequently given. As the decade passes it is found less often. It came to be held that perhaps it was merely new administrators that the Empire needed: ⁽¹⁾ in 1783 opinion held that there was something radically wrong with the system too. When the nation found an administrator who would get good results from the old policy it ceased to question it. As will be shown in the next chapter, Pitt was prepared to scrap the old colonial system with its economic restrictions. Denied permission to do so, he administered the colonies so well under the traditional code, conscious though he was of its defects, that the nation became reconciled to it again. That satisfied him. He came to agree more and more ⁽²⁾ with what has been called the Blackstonian optimism of the era, the belief that the British Constitution was all but perfect for Britons. For colonists who were not all Britons, too, it

(1) Paley, op.cit., II, p.398.

(2) See above p.72, and note 1.

was really the best that could be provided. Pitt left to French Canadians their own laws and customs. But he did so for reasons which exhibit the very essence of this complacency with which the age regarded all things British; to see them in efficient, beneficent operation in the adjoining province "would teach them that the English laws were best".⁽¹⁾ He was sure the "new subjects" would adopt English law the sooner for not having it forced on them. The entire British public unquestioningly believed in the virtues of the Constitution, even to this absurd degree that one of their leading philosophers defended "influence", that pleasing euphemism for corruption, as properly having a place in government in that it made for tranquillity.⁽²⁾

The doubt that the tie with the colonies was essentially temporary had not risen in the mind of the general public. It has been shown that it had already affected officials in the department then administering colonial affairs.⁽³⁾ A case in point would be Jenkinson's objection to colonising Newfoundland.⁽⁴⁾ He argued that if treated as a colony it would inevitably follow in a few years in the footsteps of New England. But among the unofficial public the doubters were few. At the very antipodes

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIX, 113.

(2) Paley, op.cit., pp.229 - 230. Influence is a corrective It is used "to produce not a bias of the passions but a neutrality."

(3) See above p.67, and note 2.

(4) Afterwards Earl of Liverpool. See Wraxall's comment on his views. IV, p.307, (11 - 12 April, 1786.)

of thought from each other, among such, were Dean Tucker and Thomas Paine. The former has been quoted regarding "the epide-⁽¹⁾mic madness of having colonies"; the latter maintained that should Britain retain Canada or Halifax or both, she would find herself upon the horns of a dilemma. "If they (the English) people (these colonies), they will revolt; if they do not people, they will not be worth the expense of holding."⁽²⁾ But such doubt was comparatively rare in Britain when once again the struggle with France was resumed.

(1) See above p.32.

(2) Gentleman's Magazine, 1783, vol. 53, p.49, reviewing "A Letter addressed to the Abbe Raynal on the Affairs of North America", by T. Paine, 2nd. edition.

C H A P T E R I I I .

THE LAST NAVIGATION ACT, 1783-1793.

"Wise and happy will that nation be which will be the first to adapt its policy to the new circumstances of the age, and to consent to see in its colonies nothing more than allied provinces and no longer subject States of the mother-land. Wise and happy will that nation be which is the first to be convinced that commercial policy consists wholly in employing lands in the way most advantageous for the owners, also the arms of the people in the most useful way, that is, as self-interest will enjoin if there is no coercion; and that all the rest is only illusion and vanity. When the total separation of America (from Great Britain) has forced everybody to recognize this truth and weaned the European nations from commercial jealousy, it will remove one important cause of war, and it is difficult not to desire an event which ought to bring this boon to the human race."-Vergennes, "Politique de tous les Cabinets de l'Europe".

The nineteenth century justified this prophecy of Vergennes. The loss of the colonies eventually drove home the folly of the monopoly policy. The clarity of French views of economic principles was early recognised. The influence they exercised on English thinkers did much to bring about the fulfilment of the prediction of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs. It was an influence which was operative before the commercial expansion which followed hard on American independence was wonderingly recognised. It touched leaders of the day, relatively few in number, but high placed. When the scales had fallen from their eyes they were ready to outline a policy, which, had

it been adopted, had prevented the further alienation of the severed branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. The "generous principles" they conceived were more or less acceptable. Britons seemed ready to forgive and forget. But prejudice was not dead. Awakened by the propaganda of the interests threatened, it proved strong enough, not only to overthrow the freer trade schemes of the country's leading statesmen and economists, but also to enact another Navigation Act.

The speech from the throne, on the opening of that session of Parliament to which the provisional articles of peace with America were presented, indicates the liberal trade policy of Shelburne. Moving the address of thanks to George III for having acceded to the "universal wish of his people" and given them peace, the Earl of Pembroke indicated what was quite generally felt throughout the nation, that conditions were so bad that only a radical change could, with any confidence, be looked to to restore the national finances. Voicing the sentiment of the Upper House, as the division proved, he said, "We shall most diligently turn our attention to a
 "revision of all our commercial laws and endeavor to frame
 "them upon such liberal principles as may best extend our trade
 "(1)
 "and navigation". The debate afforded the First Lord of the Treasury an opportunity effectively to enunciate the broad

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 375, 407, 409, 413.

tenets of free trade. Anent the charge that the northern boundary conceded to the Americans carried with it control of the fur trade, the Earl of Shelburne dealt with monopolies generally. "Some way or other," he contended, "they are ever justly punished". A few Canadian merchants would complain, it was inevitable; "for merchants would always love monopoly". This, however, was "the era of protestantism in trade". Britain should be the first to adopt it. His contention was supported with a brief but telling reference to her ideal geographical position between Europe and America, between North and South. In addition she had more industry, enterprise and capital than any other nation. Similarly the leader of the administration showed that no loss would follow the concessions made to France in the African gum trade. The effort to monopolise it had, in the past, cost thousands of lives, with no greater result than a share of the trade. Abandoning the monopoly would save the lives lost in a vain effort to guard it, and none the less surely afford the same share in the traffic. Shelburne's modern conception that Tobago cotton would in the end find its way into English hands has been referred to in a previous chapter.⁽¹⁾

The speakers in the Commons who most clearly reflect their leader's views are the Chancellor of the Exchequer, his namesake

(1) See chapter II, p.40.

Mr. Thomas Pitt, and Mr. Secretary Townshend. The last held that it was "obviously the interest of Great Britain to establish as close a connection as possible" with the United States. "The necessity of changing our plan of commercial relations", was the language in which Thomas Pitt alluded to the restoration of national credit. It was left to the young Chancellor of the Exchequer to make a concrete effort to embody the broader conception of trade relations in a bill which he introduced after the resignation of the Earl of Shelburne.

Before attempting to estimate the support accorded Pitt's American Intercourse Bill officially and unofficially, it may be well to enquire why the provisional articles neglected to provide formally for the renewal of trade between the signatories. Franklin's suggestion⁽¹⁾ of July that each nation should treat the ships of the other as its own, (including the remaining British colonies), was too sweeping to promise any chance of carrying the peace in Parliament if it were accepted. No compromise could be arrived at. The Coalition ministry was to succeed no better: its subsequent action proved that it was divided regarding the wisdom of amending the mercantile system so as to include the former colonies. Fox reopened negotiations with the American commissioners, and seems to have held views of a liberal order. But the

(1) "Works", VIII, p.638.

attempt was abortive. The discussion which was aroused by Pitt's bill had, in the meanwhile, exhibited not only how general the demand for amendment was, but how entrenched were the narrow interests which defended the traditional restrictions. One pamphlet⁽¹⁾ in support of the mercantile system was so popular, so marked in its effects, that the American commissioners complained bitterly.

Pitt's effort to deal with the situation by statute was unfortunate in other ways than that it complicated Fox's diplomatic problems. It was too hurriedly framed. The Prohibitory Acts still stood; action was loudly called for. In effect the American Intercourse Bill accepted Franklin's suggestion of reciprocity; minor distinctions intended to save the carrying trade for Britain were made, such as the admission of American cargoes as British while the ships which brought them were charged dues as those of aliens. The anomalous condition of the government, too, robbed it of a fair chance of becoming law. The King's aversion to the Fox-North faction kept him from filling Shelburne's place immediately: Pitt and his colleagues were ministers without a leader. The measure reflected credit on the intuition of the economist: it displayed, however, a failure to allow for prejudice, a lack of knowledge of men as they were. Adam Smith had counselled a gradual introduction of free trade

(1) Lord Sheffield, "Observations on the Commerce of the American States". 2nd. edition, June 21, 1783. 6th. edition, revised, 1784.

principles: his pupil was over-sanguine. His failure to gauge aright the weight of opinion in support of his proposal is analogous to the error of three years later regarding reform in the representative system. In both cases there was a vague, general desire for change, for a diminution of old privilege; in both cases such support proved a broken reed. The hope of a new era paled before the dread of unknown evils then indissolubly associated with constitutional innovation. Yet Pitt was able to say that some such bill had been "anxiously, loudly and repeatedly called for from all parts of the house". The Lord Advocate, fresh from communication with the shipping interests of Glasgow, declared that, in spite of the weaknesses found in the measure, the majority of merchants were for it. The statement seems to have been justified at the time. A (1) pamphlet which had then had some little vogue expressed the view that the advantages of the dependent American trade had been over-estimated. Free trade with free colonies would go far to compensate for the loss of the monopoly. Especially, urged this anonymous merchant, would this be true if South American trade should be thrown open too. All exclusive colonies should be freed. The American colonies would be well lost if their breaking away were to initiate the striking off

(1) "Consolatory Thoughts on American Independence, showing advantages that will arise from it to the Manufacturers, the Agricultural and Commercial interests of Britain and Ireland". Edinburgh. 1782. Cf. Paley, op.cit., p.232, "(We will not say the misfortunes, (but) the changes which have taken place in the British Empire".

of shackles from commerce generally. Here is reflected a breadth of view that recalls Vergennes' prediction of 1776. The Common Council of London had testified to their "firm persuasion that the great commercial interests of this country and of North America are inseparably united". The King had replied to their address that nothing on his part should be lacking "to restore without delay, and to establish such a friendly intercourse in future, as ought to result from mutual interest and returning affection"⁽¹⁾. Numerous addresses from the country on the peace had repeated the sentiment. The reaction of the landed interests from the costs of the war inclined them to look favourably upon a conciliatory policy, which, generally speaking, would be such as to avoid other causes of conflict. The nation as a whole, in a generous mood, was willing by a liberal policy to make up for the ill-advised, half-regretted obstinacy of the war years.

There was but one interest which was active in its support of the bill. This was the very influential West India planter group. With them were associated those merchants whose concern for debts outstanding in the islands bulked larger than future trade projects. In sharp opposition were the ship-builders and ship-owners of the country. For Pitt's measure threw open the trade of the West Indies to the Americans. The planters were able to make out a strong case for the necessity of doing

(1) Gentleman's Magazine, 1783, 53, pp.264, 359. Cf. above chapter II, p.29.

so. The objection — it proved insurmountable — was that thereby the very extensive three-cornered carrying trade between Britain, the former colonies, and the West Indies, would be lost. The colonial trade, along with the Newfoundland fishery, then very much in the public mind, had been so long the nursery of seamen, that the cry that ships would rot at their moorings, and British seamen be inveigled into the American service, carried the day.

Pitt seems not to have had his usual confidence in the clauses of his American Intercourse Bill. He is reported as being "by no means tenacious of any part" of it. Burke approved the principle of engrafting the now independent States of the nascent Union upon the mercantile stem; but the proposal as framed he found "crude" and "undigested".⁽¹⁾ Some of the specious fallacies of the day regarding restrictions were strongly dealt with by him,^{among them} the prohibition of the export of manufacturing tools, and of the emigration of artificers. The danger of American manufactures competing with those of Britain was grossly exaggerated, he maintained; eight thousand Irish had emigrated yearly before the war, "yet there was never a linen manufacture set up there". An abundance of cheap land in America was a guarantee that agriculture would occupy the energies of her people for generations. He would improve, not annul the navigation laws.⁽²⁾ The Lord Advocate contended that it was not

(1) Parl. Hist. XXIII, 612.

(2) John, Earl of Stair, "Facts and their Consequences, submitted to the Consideration of the Public at Large", p. 28, maintains that without American intercourse plantations "cannot be held with profit by the proprietor; and what is held unprofitably by individuals is seldom held long". (4th. Edition, 1782)

reasonable to suppose that the Americans would carry lumber to the British West Indies and return in ballast. Intercourse was certain, either direct or through the French islands. The obvious course was to recognise the facts and allow it.

William Eden, afterwards, as Pitt's commissioner, to negotiate the commercial treaty with France, was the most effective opponent of this similar proposal for reciprocity with the former colonies. His argument built together very cleverly all the latent prejudices of the many on a groundwork of national security. He showed that to abrogate the Navigation Act, would, on account of a proviso to that effect in a recent concession to Ireland, ipso facto strike the Navigation Act from the Irish statute book. ⁽¹⁾ Now that Ireland enjoyed legislative independence it was certain that once repealed it could never be restored. How deep-seated were the prejudices against any such removal of the trammels from Irish trade was soon to be revealed in Pitt's unsuccessful attempt to concede to Ireland a measure of commercial liberty. It was an effective argument against the American Intercourse Bill. The speaker next showed how soon the Americans would control the carrying trade, throwing six hundred ships out of service and beguiling away their crews. The sugar refinery would fall to them; the Irish provision trade would be ruined. Further such concessions to Americans as amounted to admitting them, for trade purposes, as still British subjects, would justify

(1) Mr. Yelverton's act provided that when the Navigation Act ceased to be binding in Britain it should lose its validity in Ireland.

Russia and Denmark , under the existing provisions of favoured nation treatment, in demanding the same consideration. Was the Chancellor of the Exchequer ready to accept "the world as British subjects?" Eden did not neglect to point out the injustice which would be done the remaining British American colonies. The loyalists now resident there might reasonably expect to have continued to them the privilege of supplying the wants of the semi-tropical colonies in provisions and lumber. Again, the proposed measure, like the provisional articles of peace, was one-sided reciprocity. What guarantee was there that the government of the United States would make any return for such generosity? He concluded by scoffing at the "generous principles" of Pitt, the paragraphs of "weedling (sic) expressions", and of "epistolae amatoriae", copied from the commercial treaty of the United States with France. He demanded strict bargaining in keeping with the traditional interests of Britain. Since something must be done at once, he suggested the repeal of the Prohibitory Acts, to be followed by an act empowering His Majesty for six months to deal with trade relations by Order-in-Council.⁽¹⁾ The latter proposal was clearly with a view to the succeeding ministry,

The Coalition allowed the American Intercourse Bill to die of postponements. How Fox endeavoured to solve the problem by negotiation has been indicated. On July 2, the Order-in-Council which was destined to be the policy of the decade was issued. It

(1) Parl. Hist., XXIII, 602ff.; again 642. The enabling statute was 23 Geo. III c.39.

marks a definite victory for the North faction in the Cabinet. The statute which entrusted such authority to the Crown was renewed periodically until 1788, when identical regulations were given direct parliamentary sanction. ⁽¹⁾ No American goods, except a specified list of which lumber and flour were the most important, were to be introduced into the West Indies (including Bahamas and Bermudas), and none of these other than by British subjects in British-built ships, British owned, "and navigated according to law". Similar restrictions were set about the export of West Indian goods to the United States.

The planters did not give up the struggle when the first Order-in-Council excluded American shipping. They considered the regulations so enforced temporary, and proceeded to gather their arguments. So did the defenders of the mercantile system. The contest raged in the pamphlets of the day. The most effective champion of the mercantile cause was Lord Sheffield. The sixth ⁽²⁾ edition of his pamphlet is dated February, 1784. It classifies the commodities of American import as those in which there will be little competition, those where there will be much, and those which Britain can not supply. The first is the most extensive class, including iron and steel, cotton goods and drugs. About each of these specified, the writer makes good points. Russian iron can still be sold as nails to America if the government will

(1) 28 Geo. III c.6. Given in Bryan Edward's "History of the British Colonies in the West Indies", 2 vols., 1793, II, p.416 n.

(2) The writer anticipates greater effectiveness for his printed argument than if it were spoken "to benches usually almost empty, except when a ministerial question depends." References are inserted in the text.

remove the duty on the raw material.(p.18). In Manchester manufactures of all kinds he sees room for great expansion, averring that in 1780, ten thousand more hands could have been employed.(p.26). Since American chemists are British trained, a preference for British medicines is certain.(p.32). The second class of articles might still be supplied to the American trade, if, to meet their demand for some foreign commodities, bonding without deposit of such articles for re-shipment were permitted. (p.34). The third class is comparatively unimportant. The defects of the mercantilist are clearly manifest in the treatment of American exports. Many classes of goods Britain should not accept from her — whale and cod products, flour and wheat, lumber, masts, ships. British fisheries and the remaining British colonies can supply the mother-country. It must have been evident that such wholesale exclusions would seriously restrict the American capacity to pay for British manufactured goods. American cotton was not for nearly a decade an important export. Treating of the needs of the West Indies, Lord Sheffield is extremely sanguine regarding the capacity of the northern continental colonies and Newfoundland to supply them.(p.59). Bounties in colonial products, notably Canadian lumber, are suggested.(pp.129, 144). In the more general treatment of the question, the danger of prematurely pledging the country to unnecessary sacrifice is indicated. "Go slow" is a policy to be adopted.(p.5). The Americans have nothing Britain needs which

will not be forthcoming in any event. They must have credit which Britain alone can afford to give. General cargoes of European goods can be so much more easily made up in Britain than elsewhere as to ensure a preference for British ports. By prudent management English merchants may have as much of the American trade as it will be to their interests to wish for. Half of that trade without the £370,000 charge for British establishments will be better than the whole was formerly. In a eulogy of the Navigation Act, Lord Sheffield concluded that the country surely would not abrogate in favour of aliens, what, in 1660, it would not see set aside for fellow-subjects in Scotland, the Act which made England great, and which would continue to bring jointly "profit and power".⁽¹⁾

Edward Gibbon described Lord Sheffield as "the defender, if not the saviour, of the Navigation Acts". The greatest exponent⁽²⁾ of the views of the planters was Bryan Edwards. His pamphlet, speeches, and "History of the West Indies" are alike able. The latter, published in 1793, presents a convenient summary of his arguments. By that year sufficient time had elapsed to allow for the heat of argument to pass, for some checking of opposing contention by recent experience, yet not sufficient to allow

(1) Sheffield's pamphlet is reviewed and endorsed in the *Gents. Mag.* 53, pt.II, p.770. See generally, *ibid.*, p.884; 57, p.415; 58, p.418-419. See also "Thoughts on the Proceedings

(2) Placed in the "highest rank of historians" by a reviewer in the *Gents. Mag.*, 70, p.793. For autobiographical details see Sketch in "History of West Indies", 1801, III, p.IXff. He was a member of the Assembly in Jamaica, then of the House of Commons. See also "Thoughts on the Proceedings of Government respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States of America". This pamphlet was recognised by Sheffield as that of a worthy opponent. Cf. preface to 6th.ed. "Observations, etc" p.10.

significant details to be lost.

The first and fundamental criticism, in which the Jamaican historian indulges, is that many British thinkers, including statesmen, had failed to distinguish between the monopoly of the colonial trade and the monopoly of the carriage of it. Indeed opponents of the planters in the late discussions had, wilfully it seemed, treated the two as one and indissoluble.⁽¹⁾ If American-built ships are available for the transportation of British merchandise at half the cost of home-built ships, surely the British merchant is benefited from their being accepted in payment of old debts, and used to carry new consignments to a solvent debtor. Otherwise "our trade, like the victims of Procustes, must be lopped and shortened to make it suit the measure of our own (ships)".⁽²⁾ Experience was to prove that Britain ran slight danger of losing any considerable portion of the carrying trade. But Edwards' contention that it could be shared, without risking a loss of the trade carried, is no more justified than the fears of his opponents regarding the loss of the mere freightage. He, too, was guilty of a confusion which,

(1) As Burke, "On Conciliation with America", 1775, had regarded the three branches of Britain's trade with the American colonies, with the West Indies, and with Africa.

(2) Edwards, "History", 1793, II, pp. 372 - 375. Cf. "A Short Address from a Manufacturer, on the Importance of the Trade of Great Britain with the United States of America", 1785, in which it is asked, "Can it be reconciled to common sense to assert, that if the Americans, or any other people, were to offer us 500 sail of vessels every year gratis, it would be against the interest of the nation (as a nation) to accept them -----?"

if not wilful, at any rate tended to weigh the balance in favour of his own argument. He confused two carrying trades, the lesser between America and the West Indian ports direct, and the much more important circuitous trade linking these ports with Britain. He himself demonstrated that the latter in 1787 afforded employment to 13,936 seamen, and, as he adds, was more important as a source of security than the Newfoundland fishery, because the shipping of the sugar islands, being in constant service, its seamen are always at command. ⁽¹⁾ A great proportion of the Newfoundland ^{fishermen}, on the other hand, remained over winter in that island, and were, therefore, inaccessible in emergency. The lesser carrying trade, it was argued, could be handled, on account of restrictions on American commodities to be imported, so as to subserve the vital interests of the islands by white seamen who would not exceed twelve hundred in number. ⁽²⁾ The advocates of the Navigation Act, however, thought of the fifteen thousand seamen, not of that handful, over the possible loss of whom it would truly have been illogical to cause the islands serious inconvenience by trade restrictions. The limitation of the right of entry to vessels not exceeding eighty tons ⁽³⁾ which Pitt suggested, or of sixty tons as the Assembly of

(1) Edwards, op.cit., II, p.389.

(2) Memorial of the Agent of Jamaica (Stephen Fuller) to His Majesty's ministers, March 8, 1785. Edwards, op.cit., II, pp.422-425. According to this proposal the intercourse was to be restricted to American ships of sixty tons.

(3) Definitely opposed on the ground that even that concession would endanger America engrossing the carrying trade in "An Address to Bryan Edwards", by John Stevenson. See review, Gentleman's Magazine, 54, pt.III, p.923.

Jamaica later advocated, would have been ineffective to prevent Americans disposing of West Indian products in Europe.

The planters were on firmer ground when their counsel criticised the statements of the capacity of the British North American colonies to supply the needs of the islands in provisions and lumber, as well as their ability to take any appreciable quantity of rum and unrefined sugars. There certainly was a tendency grossly to exaggerate on the part of their opponents. (1) Edwards appealed to statistics. In 1772, of 1208 cargoes of lumber from North America, only seven were from Canada and Nova Scotia. (2) Of 2382 vessels outward bound from the continent to the British and foreign West Indies, only thirteen "were from those provinces". He showed that the crop scarcity in Canada in the years 1779 to 1782 inclusive was so great as to necessitate the prohibition of the export of all bread, wheat and flour. At the moment of the inquiry, instituted at Pitt's suggestion by the newly appointed Committee of Trade, "a ship in the Thames was actually loading with flour for Quebec". The historian exercises no little restraint in his treatment of the wholesale fashion in which "the Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council" accepted the obviously biased statements of Lord Sheffield and his coadjutors, though he is compelled to describe the River

(1) Cf. Sheffield, *op.cit.*, pp.59, note, 66 ff.

(2) Edwards, *op.cit.*, II, p.403.

St. Lawrence as "locked up seven months in the year by an impenetrable barrier of ice", Nova Scotia as "devoted to inexorable sterility", and the island of St. John as "never yet" having "furnished food enough to keep its few inhabitants alive".

"The case was, to speak plainly and undisguisedly, that the committee of council ----- suffered themselves to be guided in their researches by men who had resentments to gratify, and secret purposes to promote. Some of those were persons whom America had proscribed for their loyalty, and unjustly deprived of their possessions. That they had become on this account objects of compassion, and claimants on the public of Great Britain, I have no wish to deny; but, without doubt, they were the last men in the world whose opinions should have been adopted concerning the establishment of a system of reciprocity and conveniency between this country and that which they had left. To suppose that such men were capable of giving an impartial and unbiassed testimony in such a case, is to suppose they had divested themselves of the common feelings of mankind". (1)

Even for the plain speaking of this passage, there was much justification alike in fact and in theory. The report of the committee of trade, as experience proved, much over-rated the capacity of the British North American colonies to provide what the islands needed so imperatively. The merit of the loyalists was bulked large. Edwards was in a position to know what

(2) evidence was weighed and what discarded. The committee held that what rum the mother country and the remaining colonies (3) could not take from the planters, the Americans would buy.

(4) The danger of retaliatory measures was discounted. British

(1) Edwards, op.cit., II, p.407 - 408.

(2) He was examined before the committee.

(3) It was demonstrated by the Jamaican agent quoted above that Britain, in 1783, purchased only 505,150 gallons out of 7,700,000 on hand for export. Ibid., p.423.

(4) It did not prove serious, though Maryland and Virginia took action before the end of the year 1783. Cf. Gents. Mag., 53, pt. II, p.884.

shipping, it was concluded, would soon prove adequate to the needs of the situation: in the meantime the islands could be cultivated at a sufficient profit notwithstanding the restrictions.

To support this last finding of the committee, was the fact that the islands actually had subsisted without untoward hardship during what were claimed to be the closer restrictions on their trade of the war. To this Edwards replied that captured prizes, chiefly American laden with provisions, had been bought by the planters. To that extent the war was a source of supply. In part, too, the islands had found resources within themselves, growing grain and cutting timber. This, Edwards maintained, was a diversion of their energies from those industries, the wholehearted prosecution of which by plantation workers was most to the advantage of the mother country.

Of the report of the committee, taken as a whole, a modern writer says, "A fuller vindication of the policy of the coalition, or a clearer statement of some of the old commercial principles, (1) could scarcely have been offered". That the nebulous sentiment in favour of a liberal understanding with the United States of America, whose relation to the mother country was universally regarded as *sui generis*, failed to off-set the representations of the mercantilists is not for a moment to be wondered at, even though three outstanding statesmen had placed themselves on record as standing for such a settlement. It is surprising,

(1) Herbert C. Bell, in the *English Historical Review*, 1916 p.439. The present writer acknowledges many suggestions from the article, pp.429 - 441.

however, that the planter interest proved so completely ineffective as to lose the case on all points, even to the compromise regarding the admission of American vessels of sixty tons and under. The brief for the islands was held by able counsel, notably Lord Penryhn, Edward Long, and Bryan Edwards. The sugar islands were valued pre-eminently above the remaining colonies. (1) The pains taken to build forts for their protection, and to sacrifice men by thousands when war ensued, without reference to the striking balance sheet of exchange between them and the mother country, sufficiently indicates that. West Indian wealth enriched England, not only in every way that commerce could, but in the constant succession of planters who returned with their gains. "There was scarcely ten miles together throughout the country ^ "where the house and estate of a rich West Indian planter were (3) "not to be seen". Generally it was admitted, as declared in the

(1) Edwards gives (II, p.391) a comparison of the two greatest branches of British commerce.

	East Indies.	West Indies.
Capital employed.....	£18,000,000.	£70,000,000.
Goods exported.....	1,500,000.	3,800,000. (inc. profits of freight)
Goods imported.....	5,000,000.	7,200,000.
Duties paid.....	790,000.	1,800,000.
Shipping.....	80,000 tons.	150,000 tons.

See generally vol. II, book VI, chap. III.

(2) Estimated according to the obsolescent balance of trade theory, the balance was adverse; but see Edwards II, P.432 note.

(3) Earl of Shelburne, Parl. Hist. XIX, 1315.

House of Commons,

"that the sugar colonies, and the commerce thereon dependent, have become the most considerable source of navigation and national wealth out of the limits of the mother country; and that no part of the national property can be more beneficially employed for the public, nor any interests better entitled to the protection of the legislature, than theirs." (1)

The student of today must conclude that the committee, to whom Pitt assigned the investigations of trade relations on 5, 1784, rejected the contentions of the planters for reciprocal relations with the United States, backed though they were by a general inclination throughout the country for such intercourse, not that they loved the West Indies less but the Navigation Act more.

The question assigned to the committee was what Eden had described as being "a great consideration, involving every question of law, policy and commerce". The onus of proof on constitutional questions of such import, before a jury of Privy Councillors, most decidedly rested upon the advocates of change. (2) Yet the hearing was no doubt a fairer one than such a court would have accorded any such plea a generation later. With the public the promptings of generosity made both ways, for the loyalists as well as for the planters and late colonists. It is probable that as early as 1784, there was stirring a sentiment which was soon to become unexpectedly widespread and influential,

(1) See the evidence of George Hibbert, Esq., merchant in London, before a Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed upon the Slave Trade, 20 March, 1790. Edwards op.cit., II, p.387.

(2) Cf. Paley, op.cit., II, p.196. "Political innovations commonly produce many effects besides those that are intended." P.197, "Changes ought not to be adventured upon without a comprehensive discernment" of what they entail.

sympathy with the enslaved blacks of the West Indies, and antipathy towards the whites, their masters. The planters were described as "wallowing in wealth",⁽¹⁾ and were accused, on the basis of their petition of 1775 on behalf of the continental colonists, of having abetted the American rebellion.⁽²⁾ Sheffield had insisted that the West Indians could fit out ships of their own or would deserve to suffer.⁽³⁾ On their side the planters suggested that the finding of the committee was influenced by "a lurking taint of resentment and malignity, the relicks of former provocation against the Americans; and at least as ardent a desire to wound the new republic, through the sides of the West Indians, as to benefit Nova Scotia at their expense."⁽⁴⁾

After the last sifting of the arguments, it is probably true that the desire to help the loyalists, the disinclination to advance American interests, the nascent antipathy to the slave-owners, and the congenital aversion to sweeping legislative innovation together counted for less in the scale than the time-honoured belief that the monopoly of the colonial market was lucrative, and that the carrying trade was the nation's chief

(1) Cf. Sheffield op.cit., p.161. Note that in the calculations on which he based the new tax of April 1799, Pitt estimated the income derived from the British West Indies at £4,000,000 per annum, four times that from the rest of the world.

(2) George Chalmers, "Opinion on Interesting Subjects", cited in Edwards II, P.401.

(3) Sheffield, op.cit., p.147.

(4) Edwards, op.cit., II, p.401.

security. The time for free trade was not yet. Sheffield had set forth its case very fairly. He had shown that, by transcending the restrictions of the Navigation Act, Britain might engross a considerable portion of the carrying trade of Europe. Having done so, he retorts that the moment of writing saw more room for expansion within the ambit of the Navigation Act than the country's capital was in a position to avail itself of. Further, that even with things as they stood, foreign commerce attracted capital disproportionately for the good of the state. The consequence was that agriculture was under-supplied. For the landed interests his logic must have had a special appeal: the merchants needed no teaching regarding the virtues of the Act. In part the ⁽¹⁾ "Wealth of Nations" would substantiate the argument just reviewed. Adam Smith had cautioned against the precipitate abrogation of the protective system. He had also placed foreign commerce low in the list of nationally advantageous uses of capital. His support was less equivocally accorded to the final argument of the mercantilists. "The great object of the Navigation Act is naval strength: it therefore sacrifices these commercial ⁽²⁾ speculations to strengthen our marine". So highly was the carrying trade rated by Lord Sheffield as a means to this end, that, rather than abandon it, he would counsel giving up the

(1) Edited by J.E.T. Rogers, 1869, II, p.187; I, pp.373, 377, II, 271.

(2) Sheffield, op.cit., p.237.

(1)
 West India Islands altogether. Adam Smith's justification of the Navigation Act, though actuated originally by "national animosity" as being as wise as though "dictated by the most deliberate wisdom", defence being of much more importance than opulence, is too familiar to need repetition. (2)

The influence of the much-debated work of this acclaimed father of political economy can not during this decade be regarded as very considerable. His authority is first quoted in Parliament in 1783. (3) Before the century's end he is appealed to thirty odd times. Addington was studying his book in 1787. (4) It is a commonplace that Pitt had been greatly influenced by it. How much more effective on the young chancellor and first lord direct association with Lord Shelburne was, is probably beyond the determination of research.. Other sources of new thought in England would appear, from circumstantial evidence, to have contributed more to the opinion which then made for the removal of mercantile restrictions than Adam Smith's comprehensive study.

(1) Sheffield, op.cit., p.152.

(2) Smith, op.cit., II, pp.37, 38; cf. note, p.37, in which the laudation of the Act occasioned surprise, and is put down to "municipal prejudice".

(3) Sir John Sinclair's "The History of the Public Revenue of the British Empire" was first published in 1785. Part II shows four specific, foot-note references to the "Wealth of Nations", pp.26, 29, 35, 124. The last describes the mercantile system as having "received such a blow" therefrom, that the extension of the system is recommended with some diffidence.

(4) For suggestions in three sentences here I am indebted to Buckle's, "History of Civilisation", 3 vols., 1902, I, p.214 note.

essays

Hume's political^A preceded his young friend's by twenty four years.

In them, in more pointed fashion, are exposed the prevalent fallacies regarding the balance of trade, and jealousy of a commercial rival's prosperity. (1) Burke, too, to cite one other among contemporary thinkers, was so familiar with some of the substantial ideas, which posterity has credited Adam Smith with making current coin, as to use them lightly in easy correspondence (2) as the matter of his pleasantries.

In the periodical literature of the day, Dr. Smith is only very occasionally referred to before the end of the century, thus confirming the testimony of Hansard. The first significant reference found in the Gentleman's Magazine is in 1787. It is highly commendatory. The economist is associated with Necker and Paley; and his work is "full of important matter, and is an excellent study for all statesmen." (3) This writer had certainly been influenced by the author he praises. He had found in Adam Smith's treatment of colonial trade and its relation to home industry the justification he sought for recommending

(1) Hume, "Essays", 2 vols., 1788, (pt.I, 1742; pt.II, 1752) e.g. p.279, "a fear that all their gold and silver may be leaving them"; again, p.296, "the increase of riches and commerce in any one nation, instead of hurting, commonly promotes the riches and commerce of all its neighbours".

(2) To Dr. Robertson, June 10, 1777, acknowledging the gift of his history, concludes, sending "a temporary production" for his "immortal work"; "Our exchange is like the politics of the times. You send out solid wealth, the accumulation of ages, and in return you are to get a few flying leaves of poor American paper. However you have the mercantile comfort of finding the balance of trade infinitely in your favour; and I console myself with the smug consideration of uninformed natural acuteness, that I have my warehouse full of goods at another's expense". "Corres." op.cit.II, 161

(3) See next page.

Scottish fisheries to the attention of the legislature, arguing that improvement to be effected there would help England "beyond any schemes of distant possessions or attempts at colonization". Another reference occurs in 1793. "No one would consider him (Smith) an upholder of an established system."⁽¹⁾ While two years later a writer who claims some familiarity with current economics laments the utter absence of anything really authoritative on the subject of monopolies.⁽²⁾ The advocates of the abolition of the slave trade seem to have neglected surprisingly completely Smith's exposition of the false economy of slave labour.⁽³⁾ Bryan Edwards is better informed, though his reference is regularly to "the author of an 'Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations'". He avails himself, not only of the criticism of colonial monopoly, but also of the wealth of historical allusion drawn from foreign countries.⁽⁴⁾ Though the basis for

(3) Gentleman's Magazine, 57, pt. I, p.207. The editor's footnote, even then, (1787), traces the Eden treaty with France to his influence, and shows that Smith had concurred in theory with the effort to lighten Ireland's burden of mercantile restrictions.

(1) Ibid., 63, p.401.

(2) Ibid., 65, pt.II, p.314. "Much has been said and written about monopolizing, engrossing etc.; but nothing that I have met with yet is by a person thoroughly informed and a competent master of the subject." (October, 1795.)

(3) Clarkson, however, lists Dr. Smith among the "forerunners" of the abolitionists, both quoting from "A Theory of Moral Sentiments", and referring to "the dearness of African labour", as set forth in the work of 1776.

(4) E.g. Edwards, op.cit., II, p.461; again p.462.

generalisation here is narrow, it would seem that as yet the "Wealth of Nations" was not exercising any appreciable influence on colonial policy. It is to be noted that special information concerning the Kirkcaldy sage is suggested by the first magazine comment cited. Further, on the question of the Navigation Act, it is obvious that no clear-cut influence should be looked for. The handling it had been accorded might be reduced to this, that though commercially indefensible, the Act was, from the point of view of national defence, the height of wisdom. However the views set forth regarding the monopoly of colonial trade may be considered today, it is clear that when they can be described by an admitted authority as "intricate and difficult",⁽¹⁾ their influence then on the ordinary reader would be both ambiguous and inconsiderable.

During the decade the Newfoundland Fishery was much in the public mind, and rightly so, as a nursery of seamen. A fear was entertained in some quarters that residency on the island would make it a colony: and that, "if it were treated as a colony, it would infallibly follow in a few years the example of New England."⁽²⁾ The restrictions which reserved the trade for bona

(1) Nicholson, "A Project of Empire", p.196. Cf. Cunningham, "Growth of English Industry and Commerce", II, p.596, for the opposite view that the simplicity and clearness of the "Wealth of Nations" gave it "within a few months" ---- "a considerable power".

(2) Wraxall, op.cit., IV, p.307. This fear was kept to the fore by the merchants involved in the Newfoundland trade for purposes of their own. See generally the evidence of the representatives of the merchants of Dartmouth and Poole, in the reports of March 26, April 24, and June 17, 1793, in "Reports", 1715-1801, X, pp.391-503. The trade is, however, not unanimous, on the hurt of residency or the ulterior danger.

(1)
 fide British fishermen were already sufficiently explicit. The
 temptation to leave supernumerary members of crews on the island
 over winter had recently occasioned more drastic legislation. (2)

Jenkinson had sponsored the act of 26 Geo.III. His were
 described as enlarged views regarding the Navigation Acts. That
 proved to mean that he favoured the extension of the principle
 on the grounds both of commercial advantage and national
 security. (3)
 The official conception of Newfoundland at this time
 is interestingly put by William Knox before the 1793 committee
 on the Newfoundland trade.

"The island of Newfoundland had been considered in all times as
 "a great English ship moored near the banks during the fishing
 "season for the convenience of English fishermen. The governor
 "was considered as a ship's captain, and all those concerned in
 "the fishery business as his crew, and subject to naval discipline
 "while there, and expected to return to England when the season
 "was over" (4)

(5)

He submitted that if no grants of land were made, and no civil

(1) Cf. Sheffield, op.cit., p.88. Burke described the
 fisheries as "mines richer than Mexico or Peru".

(2) E.g. 15 Geo. III c.31, and, 26 Geo.III c. 26. See above
 p.97. The Star Chamber had declared that "no master or owner of
 any ship should transport to Newfoundland any persons who were not
 of the ship's company, nor such as were to plant or settle there".

(3) Wraxall, op.cit., IV, p.308, reports his opinion as, "If
 proper means could be devised for securing to Great Britain the
 navigation trade, though we had recently lost a vast dominion in
 America, we might almost have been said to have gained an Empire".
 See the eulogy of Lord Liverpool's act in Gents. Mag. 72,pt.I, p.120.

(4) The speaker had been an Under Secretary of State for the
 Colonies during the North régime. To him is attributed the twelve
 years of drafting of the Order-in-Council of July 2, 1783, which
 reserved the West Indian trade to British shipping.

(5) Such, for example, as the 100,000 acres on Esquimaux Bay
 (Labrador) to the Society of the Unitas Fratrum by Order-in-Council,
 May 3, 1769.

governor appointed, there would be no danger of this provision ship becoming a colony.⁽¹⁾ The west country merchants failed to make out their case. It was shown that the trade was not being seriously injured by the regulations against which protests were made.⁽²⁾ The Chief-Justice of Newfoundland dealt roundly with the allegations of the merchants, showing that the trade was affording a legitimate profit, that the objection to residency was spurious, in that it made their shore fishermen cheaper, and that the effectual administration of justice was the real grievance of the Poole and Dartmouth interests. Pitt's budget speeches in the later eighties regularly referred to the trade as prosperous, a source of national gratification, and an affirmation of success of the restrictive policy.⁽³⁾

The Act of 28 Geo. III, which gave legislative sanction to the policy based for five years on successive Orders-in-Council, has been called the Last Navigation Act. It has been customary to refer to it, *inter alia*, as proving that the American War of Independence taught British administrators no lesson. Judged by the standards of its own day, it achieved a fair measure of success: or, rather, it was regarded as having done so. It is true that results proved that the hopes, built on the capacity of the remaining American colonies to cater for the

(1) Report of 24 April, 1793, *op.cit.*, X, pp.413, 414. The evidence of J. Jeffrey, p.394, shows equal confidence in the islands not becoming a colony.

(2) In particular, sections 14, 15, and 17 of 15 Geo.III c.31 were complained of. One witness deprecates the introduction of "the glorious uncertainty of the law". "Reports", *op.cit.*, X, pp. 395, 396.

(3) See below p. 113 and note (1)

needs of the sugar islands, proved over-sanguine in the extreme. The planters must have elicited a moiety of comfort in their years of scarcity from the justification of their predictions. Nova Scotia so far failed, that in 1784 she was compelled to sue for "the insertion of a clause in the prohibitory act, to
 "authorise the admission of both lumber and provisions into that
 "province from the United States"⁽¹⁾. The report of the committee had stated that persons of experience in the Canadian grain trade were of the opinion "that an annual export of 300,000 bushels
 might, in a few years, be depended on"⁽²⁾. The West Indian products, for which the remaining American colonies, including Newfoundland, afforded the island an outlet, were valued in 1787 at only
 £100,506. 17. 10.⁽³⁾ An effort had been made to facilitate the admission of semi-tropical produce. The Canadian duty on
 rum had been reduced to sixpence a hogshead.⁽⁴⁾ Canadian merchants showed a desire for the encouragement of the inter-colonial
 intercourse.⁽⁵⁾ The poverty of the northern provinces, however, was an effectual bar to any very considerable exchange.

(1) Edwards, op.cit., II, p.417.

(2) Ibid. p.409.

(3) ibid. p.419.

(4) Gentleman's Magazine, 1788, 58, p.1082.

(5) Merchants of Three Rivers to Committee of Council for Commerce and Police. Dec. 28, 1786. Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.929. They recommend that "foreign molasses should not be imported unless subject to such duty as will bring it to an equal value of molasses imported from the British Islands".

It is also true that for periods of many months at a time the scarcity in the West Indies was such that the restrictive regulations had to be suspended by local ordinance. For this the disastrous consequences of a series of hurricanes ⁽¹⁾ is probably responsible rather than the exclusion of American shipping. After the storm of July 30, 1784, for example, the Lieutenant-Governor, with the advice of his council, by proclamation authorised the free import of provisions and lumber in foreign bottoms for a period of four months. Reiterated petitions secured the extension of the period to January 31, 1785. The British Government endeavoured, by annual acts of indemnity, to secure at least formal observance for the restrictive system. Opinion in the islands tempted governors to connive at unnecessary suspensions of the act. ⁽²⁾ It was such that smuggling flourished. More logical arrangements were pending with America when the decade closed.

The disappointing inabilities of the colonies on the Gulf of St. Lawrence to furnish what the islanders required; and the relaxation of the regulations, (partly, at least, in consequence) constitute the unsatisfactory side of the picture. The Act of

(1) Report of the Committee of the Assembly of Jamaica on the Slave Trade. Hurricanes occurred in 1780, '81, '84, '85 and '86. "To the repeated calamities, and the unfortunate measure of interdicting foreign supplies", they attributed the deaths of 15,000 negroes between 1780 and 1787. Edwards, op.cit., II, pp. 412, 415.

(2) Sheffield, op.cit., p.238, notes that some Governors have boasted of dispensing with the Navigation Act in favour of the Americans.

28 Geo.III was credited with decidedly pleasing results as well. British shipping flourished. The carrying trade with the colonies and America was given much of the credit. Pitt found ground for exultation in this connection. His budget speeches reflect the confidence with which he viewed maritime expansion. In 1787, he included the carrying trade with the colonies, along with the Newfoundland fisheries, and the Greenland whale fishery, as enterprises which, nourished by the recent extensions of the restrictive system, were rapidly restoring not only the nation's finances but also its strength at sea. (1) Ireland succeeded beyond expectation where Nova Scotia failed. (2) Her export of beef and pork were welcomed in the West Indies. While the treatment of British ships in American ports left much to be desired, the retaliation of a drastic order, which had been feared in the early years of the prohibitory policy, did not materialise. The hardship the West Indies suffered evoked progressively less sympathy in the home country. The development of the anti-slavery agitation gave the planters other things to think about; and they relinquished their unavailing protests against the exclusion of American shipping to defend themselves against the new attack.

(1) "It was evident that our exports and imports, notwithstanding the immense loss of our American colonies - from the commencement of which era some gloomy spirits had argued the down-fall of Britain - ---- were now as great as in the most flourishing year before the last war". Budget speech, 1787, quoted from the Gentleman's Magazine, 58, pt.2 p.988.

(2) The acts opening colonial trade to Ireland were 18 Geo.III c.55 and 20 Geo.III cc.6, 10,18.

It seems probable that a deep-seated uneasiness, regarding the real attitude of Great Britain to the colonies in the West Indies after the concession of American independence, rendered the planters and merchants with a stake in the sugar islands more tractable than they had otherwise been. This misgiving may have induced a docility, unapproached under other circumstances, in the case not only of the tightening of the mercantile bond to to the exclusion of the American shipping, but also in a certain tendency to withhold the last word in opposition to the proposed abolition of the Slave Trade. It is not suggested that either was unopposed: merely that both were opposed with a degree of diffidence, — the diffidence a mortgagor might feel in refusing incidental demands, only half-legitimate, urged by the mortgagee, on whose complaisance his well-being depended.

This uneasiness sprang from the changing attitude of Britain to the colonies, a change that was potential rather than actual, that resulted in doubt in the colonies rather than fear. The clearest expression of it is found in Bryan Edwards' concluding chapter. ⁽¹⁾ He discusses "Charges brought against the Planters introductory of Opinions and Doctrines the Design of which is to prove, that the Settlement of the British Plantations was improvident and unwise". He animadverts to them with hesitancy. He would pass them by as the product of small minds actuated by petty envy of "a few opulent individuals among the planters resident in Great Britain", but that he finds the opinion to which they afford

(1) "History of the West Indies", edition of 1793, II, chap.V, pp. 426 - 478.

a basis beginning to be entertained by "persons of ability and influence".⁽¹⁾ Outstanding among these was Mr. Thomas Irving,

Inspector-General of Exports and Imports. Examined before a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Slave Trade,

⁽²⁾
this official had advanced such views as these :-

(1) That British capital had been better employed in commerce and agriculture at home than in settling the West Indies. (3)

(2) That a good crop in the West Indies does not return a net profit of 6% on the capital invested.

(3) That the duties on West Indian commodities fall on the consumer.

(4) That the planters' monopoly of the British market heightens the cost of sugar 20 or 30%.

(5) That the system of drawbacks and bounties which enables the British importer to dispose of surplus sugar abroad is dangerous and destructive.

Rightly enough the West Indians with their historian might infer that these doctrines "cannot fail, if adopted by ministers, and "carried from the national councils into measures, to widen our "recent wounds, and make a general massacre of our whole system "of colonization". (4)

Bryan Edwards holds that such views were originally associated with an effort to reconcile the nation to the loss of the American colonies. He dreads their becoming entrenched

(1) Edwards, op.cit., II, P.427. E.g. Sheffield and Chalmers referred to above p.103, and footnotes (2) and (3).

(2) Report of Commons Committee on Slave Trade of April 7, 1791. Cf. Edwards, op.cit., II, pp.427, 428.

(3) In opposition to similar charges the agents of the islands from time to time made such statements concerning the return made by the West Indies on British investments as that given above, p.102 Cf. the report of Mr. Shirley to the Jamaica House of Assembly, Nov 23, 1792. Edwards, op.cit., II, pp.435-6; 438, appendix to vol.II.

(4) Ibid. p.427. Edwards was not unaware how powerfully the expense of colonial defence added to these questionings would militate against British contentment with the existing system of empire.

(1)
in public opinion. His refutation of them denies that colonial "interests in general are distinct from, and in some respects opposed to, the general interests of the empire". Whatever truth such a conception may have had when applied to the interests of the continental colonies, it has none when the reference is to the island colonies. Their produce should stand on precisely the same footing as the mother country's own. Sugar is raised by British subjects and sold exclusively in British markets.

"The income which the nation derives from her sugar plantations comprehends the whole of their produce". The individual Briton is ignorant of the fact that ⁽²⁾ ^{the excess} he pays for plantation sugar over the cost of foreign-grown sugar goes to the refiner in England and to the state. A point is made of the prohibition from refining their own sugar under which the islands suffered. ⁽³⁾

But the West Indian purpose is not to find grounds on which to object to the mercantile system. It is rather to show that it is not an unadulterated boon to the planter, that the monopoly

(1) It begins to appear both officially (see above p.67 and appendix p405) and unofficially as in the expostulation of "Pl---t" that "the improvement of our home dominions is infinitely more politic in every possible view than an attention to distant possessions, which are always burdensome and mischievous to the parent state, though some individuals may be benefited by them." Gentleman's Magazine, 1787, 57, pt.I, p.207. See also Lord Sheffield on the Sierra Leone Company bill: below p.162; Parl. Hist., XXIX, 651.

(2) Edwards, op.cit., II, p.432.

(3) This was effected by charging a duty of £4.13s. 8d. the cwt. on refined sugar, while raw sugar paid 15s. See the outline of the loss involved to the planter. Edwards, op.cit., II, pp.462 - 466.

he enjoys in Britain is but the obverse of an interdicted sale in Europe. If British statesmen will but look to the facts, the historian avers that they will find much more advantage accruing to them from the mercantile system than the propositions complained of suggest. But if the system is to be abandoned let it be cancelled wholly. "Let the release be reciprocal, extending equally to one party and the other".⁽¹⁾ In concluding the chapter, very sketchily touched on here, Edwards reverts to the injustice of a distorted conception of the West Indian planter,⁽²⁾ a mere caricature which represents him as a bloated profiteer battenning on the privileges tradition has given him. As a British subject rather than a West Indian, he would put the disadvantages of the situation of the islands in the background. He trusts that the mother country will not allow the opinion to take root that there are no disadvantages for the planter, that the restrictive trade policy of the Empire was one in which the home land bore more than its share.

On the whole British opinion agreed that the continuation of the mercantile system after 1783 had been successful. How logical it was to attribute any considerable proportion of Britain's

(1) An Act of the previous session, entitled, "An Act for regulating the allowance of the drawback, and payment of the bounty, on the exportation of sugar and coffee into the Bahama and Bermuda islands, in foreign ships", was causing sugar growers concern at the moment of writing. See report thereon to the Jamaican Legislature. Edwards, op.cit., II, pp.483 ff. The opening of the British market to East Indian sugar was mooted, and this constituted another cause of trepidation in the West Indies.

(2) Edwards is not referring in particular to the rhetoric of abolitionists. That he is willing to allow for. He finds the economic doubt in English minds a much more insidious foe to the stability of the statusquo.

increasing commerce and more flourishing marine to that policy is quite another question. When in 1796, and again in 1807, commercial agreements more acceptable to American ship-owners were arrived at, the carrying trade with the West Indies was largely and quickly lost to them. To the eighteenth century mind, this would be conclusive proof that the further restrictions adopted regarding colonial trade by order-in-council, then by the last Navigation Act, had been justified.

(1)

In the later years of the decade the surprise of Britons at the nation's recovery can be compared only to their certainty at the close of the previous war that her position was irretrievable. Pitt has just been quoted in a foot-note as treating such fears with contumely. They were real enough in 1783. Pitt's nature was not such as to entertain fear long. None the less he gloried in the revival. Relatively to France, the country was doing splendidly. As Sheffield had predicted, — if she would be

(1) Sinclair, op.cit., pt. II, pp.93,94, finds ground for confidence in the nation's quick recovery as early as 1785. Arthur Young called the rapid financial rehabilitation, "one of the most remarkable and singular experiments in the science of politics that the world has ever seen: for a people to lose an empire — thirteen provinces — and to GAIN by that loss an increase of wealth, felicity and power". "Travels during 1787-90".

Even foreigners who visited England within ten years of the loss of the colonies saw prosperity which promised completely to compensate for them. See the review of F.A.Wenderborn's "A View of England towards the Close of the Eighteenth Century", in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1791, vol.61, p.256.

(1)
 true to herself and resist the importunity of innovators who
 would scrap the Navigation Act, — she had now no reason to
 dread her old rival. Sheffield was acclaimed⁽²⁾ and the act he
 had saved was eulogised.

Colonial policy, 1783 - 1793, in its economic aspects, was
 consistently mercantilist. In the early years opinion questioned
 the wisdom of continuing the monopolistic policy. Confronted by
 seeming proofs of its success, it acquiesced in the later years.
 The statement is frequently made that the loss of the American
 colonies occasioned a revolution in the economic policy of the
 country.⁽³⁾ It is certainly true in its larger outline: but the
 recrudescence of belief in the Navigation Act, which the decade
 witnessed, should condition the statement. These years illustrate
 Professor' Dicey's point regarding the change of opinion which,
 like the tide, ebbs from its very height. The point at which
 either turns is often determined with some difficulty. In the
 case of opinion regarding the Navigation Act as applied to the
 colonies, it is clearly towards the end rather than the
 beginning of the decade.

(1) It was characteristic of Sheffield's conservatism that
 he should say, "The Independence of America has encouraged the
 wildest sallies of the imagination". *op.cit.*, p.1.

(2) The freedom of the city of Glasgow was one of the many
 honours conferred on him for his contribution to the defence of
 the act.

(3) Cunningham, *op.cit.*, II, p.583.

CHAPTER IV.

CONVICTS, SLAVES AND ABORIGINES. 1783-1793.

"A spirit of philanthropy evidently pervaded the minds of the leading public characters of this period."

- Gifford.

The opinion which most definitely questioned, and most widely influenced, colonial policy during this decade, probably during the half century with which this study is concerned, was that associated with the awakening of the national conscience to the dictates of humanity. The old empire was barely touched by such specific reaction to moral obligation. Otherwise the Assiento clause of the Treaty of Utrecht had not been so highly valued. A modern rationalist puts it somewhat roughly as a negative advantage, asking how Clive and Hastings had fared in India with a crowd of missionaries creating prejudices against their methods both in the native mind and in that of the British Public.⁽¹⁾ But the second empire was to be quickened by the humanitarian impulse, to a greater or less degree, to its farthest-flung dependency. It has already been shown that the weight of Church opinion contributed the clergy reserved clauses to the act which gave a constitution to Canada. And it has been suggested that the

(1) A.W. Benn, "Modern England", 2 vols., 1908, p.20. Oglethorpe's founding of Georgia as an escape for the poor might be considered an exception to prove the rule.

opposition to the West Indian planters, who protested against the reassertion of the restrictive principles of the old colonial monopoly, was stiffened by a growing impatience with them as slave-owners. In this chapter the direct, rather than the incidental, contributions of the new humanitarianism to policy will be considered.

It would seem to be perfectly correct to characterise the distinct sensitiveness of the nation at large to the call of humanity as new. "It is generally described as an almost sudden
(1)
awakening of the national conscience." The coincidence of a number of developments in social history in the reign of George the Third, in part at least, explain the phenomenon. The break-up of the traditional relationship between the landlord and the estate worker occasioned great hardship. By becoming operatives English villagers divorced themselves from the unostentatious charity characteristic of many lords of the manor. The need of benevolent ministrations on the part of others was accordingly increased by this separation, even before the evils of congested manufacturing towns developed. At the same time the growth of the press, the improvement in cross-country communications by the construction of hard roads, and the general migration attendant upon the industrial developments in the midlands, revealed more fully what distress existed. Not only was there now greater need, but there had come as the aftermath of the

(1) Leslie Stephen, "The English Utilitarians", 3 vols. 1900. vol.I, p.113.

Wesleyan revival a greater sense of responsibility for the inequities of society. Whether the very crystallisation of the individualistic tendencies in English life which are traced at least from Locke, by some inscrutable working of the law of compensation, concomitantly created its corrective in a quickening of the humane faculties, is a question for the national psychologist. Justice to Wesley and the Evangelical Movement does not involve, necessarily, the censure of the leaders of thought in other realms than religion. Philosophy was contributing to the stimulation of fellow feeling; and so, in part, was political economy. The attack on state interference in the interest of individual liberty, *laissez-faire* in short, envisaged the improvement of the lot of the worker as well as the increase of the capital of the entrepreneur. By pointing out that Bentham and Wesley "were really allies as much as antagonists",⁽¹⁾ the historian of eighteenth century thought corrects the exaggeration in the "sudden awakening" quotation above. Whether they aimed at a change of hearts or a change of laws, the reformers of the later years of the century were both manifestations of their age, an age which despite its detractors makes for advance all along the line. More of the movements of the time furthered the humanitarian tendency than are dreamt of in the philosophy of many historians.

(1) Leslie Stephen, *op.cit.*, vol. I, p.136.

Where it was most needed humanitarianism first made itself felt, in the reform of English prisons. The work of John Howard and James Neild needs no recapitulation here. It was outstanding ; yet it was also characteristic of the rapidly widening sympathies of the age. It had its effect: ⁽¹⁾ not what the reformers might have wished, but something great and enduring none the less. One of them found the acclaim of his fellow-countrymen ⁽²⁾ embarrassing in the extreme. Even this eagerness to acknowledge the worth of the example Howard had set is a mark of the humane instincts which were asserting themselves. It must be remembered that Howard's reforms involved national expenditure, and still were approved.

Where a superficial student of social history might least expect to find them, humane tendencies were actively and universally at work — in the administration of criminal law. The code itself is notorious for its Draconian severity. Still worse its sanguinary penalties were attached to offences quite without method. It was "a heterogeneous mass, concocted too often on the spur of the moment". ⁽³⁾ The heavy penalties attached to comparatively trivial offences, such as death for "breaking down the mound of a

(1) E.g. in 16 Geo.III c.43, and 19 Geo.III c.74. Even North's government was moved to set aside £10,000 for repairing Newgate. Cf. Gentleman's Magazine, 1782, 52, pt.II, p.466.

(2) Howard hastened home from abroad to protest against a subscription which was being raised for a memorial to his disinterested services. - Dictionary of National Biography. He was thanked at the Bar of the House of Commons for his "humanity and zeal". Commons Journals, XXXIV, 535.

(3) Colquhoun, "A Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis", 1796, pp.12, 13.

fish-pond whereby the fish escape", ⁽¹⁾ defeated its own purpose. "The injured, through compassion, forbore to prosecute; juries "through compassion, sometimes forgot their oaths, and either "acquitted the guilty or mitigated the nature of the offence; and "judges, through compassion, respited one half of the convicts, ⁽²⁾ "and recommended them to royal mercy." The public deplored the increase in crime. It seems to have diagnosed the evil shrewdly enough. A batch of fifty eight prisoners sentenced to death during the sessions which ended on September 19, 1783, at the Old Bailey, a journalist wrote that it was "a melancholy proof of the want of vigour in our police, the indiscriminate rigour in our laws and the multiplicity of our penal statutes." ⁽³⁾ At least four chances of escape made breaking the law an attractive gamble with-out the incentive of due necessity. ⁽⁴⁾ Statistics are easily available of the culprits "vomited back upon society in vast "numbers year after year, and encouraged to renew their former ⁽⁵⁾ "practices by the facilities they experience in escaping justice".

(1) Colquhoun, op.cit., p.13, note.

(2) Blackstone's "Commentaries", ed. R.M.Kerr, 4th. edn.1876, IV, p.14.

(3) Gentleman's Magazine, 1783, 53, pt.II, p.302.

(4) The chance of escaping first, detection, then conviction; of mercy from the jury's believing the penalty excessive, or, finally of pardon (humanity becoming the friend of every one doomed to die) Colquhoun, op.cit, p.26.

(5) Ibid., p.8. Cf. p.32 for 4262 acquitted in the seven years prior to 1792; or more strikingly the table, p.226, of persons tried at the Old Bailey, April 1793 - March 1794, showing that of 1060 committed only 493 were punished. Note that transportation for seven years is the next gradation of punishment shown after six months imprisonment.

The writer of the "Commentaries" cites the proposal of "The Marquis Beccaria" of a scale of crimes with a corresponding scale of punishments. It is evident that he regarded it as ideal, but ideal in the sense of visionary. Englishmen could suggest practical reforms. The energetic London magistrate already quoted did so, with a wealth of ideas which might be described as truly modern - the futility of severe penalties uncertainly enforced, the reformation of the offender as a co-ordinate aim in criminal jurisprudence, houses of correction with incentives to good conduct, provision for the discharged prisoner facilitating his return to a lawful occupation. Bentham, Romilly and Mackintosh were to come.

Meanwhile the jails were everywhere over-crowded. The loss of the American colonies had put an end to a cheap, and not, on the whole, inhuman method of disposing of convicts by transportation. An act of 16 Geo.III authorised the use of hulks for the accommodation of the worst offenders. Such a system of farming out prisoners invited abuses; they followed. The contractor neglected the clauses of his agreement, the prisoners escaped, or,

(1) Blackstone, op.cit., IV, p.14.

(2) Colquhoun, op.cit., pp.8, 10, 15, 264, 265, and note.

(3) Wraxall, op.cit., IV, pp.108, 109.

(4) Lecky, op.cit., VII, p.325.

(5) See the evidence of John Howard re. the hulk "Justitia", report presented by Sir Charles Bunbury, 15 April, 1778, Commons Journals, 36, p.928.

(6) Johnson, "Works", V, pp. 275, 276.

if they lived, were liberated, schooled to proficiency in crime and utterly depraved by years of such associations. The hulks (1) were worse than transportation: (2) a site for a penal colony was obviously in demand. (3)

For some years there was great uncertainty regarding the disposition to be made of prisoners sentenced to transportation. Writing to North, July 12, 1783, the King is under the impression that some of them might still be accepted in America. The late colonists cannot expect any favour from him, but "men unworthy to remain in this island" they might have. Six days later he writes again "As Mowre's offer of conveying the convicts to (4) "Nova Scotia, if they are not admitted in the rebel provinces, is "so much more moderate than the proposal of Hamilton, it ought (5) "to be accepted." A year later the Solicitor-General confessed to a questioner in the House of Commons that the government still (6) had no place for them. Mr. Hussey suggested New Zealand; (Sir) Joseph Banks had recommended Botany Bay to a committee of the

(1) Report of Lord Beauchamp, 28 July, 1785, that in the hulks, especially, they "corrupt and confirm each other in every species of villainy". Commons Journals, 40, p.1161.

(2) This is shown by the practice of reducing the sentence when the prisoner condemned to transportation had to serve his time in the hulks.

(3) Such was the tenor of the report of July, 1785.

(4) August 16, 1783, The Gents, Mag. says of convicts embarked for Nova Scotia, "the loyalists will be placed in fine company"; of others bound for Africa, "a much more proper place for them." 53, pt.II, p.711.

(5) George III to North, July 18, 1783. Donne, op.cit., II, p.442. Government had once paid £5 a head for the passage of convicts. Prior to the war contractors found such a demand for them in Maryland that they carried them free of charge. So Duncan Campbell testified. See Commons Journals, 36, p.928; 37, p.310.

House of Commons as early as 1779. An act of the year 1784 empowered courts to order the transportation of prisoners beyond the seas, and to assign their service "to the contractor who shall undertake such transportation"⁽¹⁾. With no certainty of being able to transfer their rights in convict labour to others at a profit, contractors hesitated. Before the act of 1776 authorised the use of hulks, deportees had been carried for a short time to the West Coast of Africa. There, their fate had been what Burke, in the name of humanity, protested against condemning others to. This was on March 16, 1785. He understood that government was recurring to the West Coast settlement. His argument was that it was the bitterest mockery to send those whom the law had spared to die of fever. Burke's interposition probably stayed the action of the ministry.⁽²⁾ A search had been made for a more salubrious quarter farther south. A convict settlement in the vicinity of Algoa had furnished a favourable point of call for East India ships. It had served foreign policy well, too, constituting a guard on the Cape, on which France seemed to have fixed her ambitious designs. Though a frigate was sent, writes the negotiator of the French

(6) March 11, 1784. Parl. Hist. XXIV, 755.

(1) 24 Geo.III c.56. Recommended by Sir Charles Bunbury's committee to which Banks had testified, as early as 1 April, 1779. Commons Journals, 37, p.314. Cf. Colquhoun, *op.cit.*, p.282.

(2) Even Nepean testified before the committee which reported May 9, 1785, that the island of Lemane, 400 miles up the river Gambia was most favoured by government, though all agreed that the climate was deadly. Commons Journals, 40, p.954.

commercial treaty of the previous year, no suitable place for
 "a settlement for the purpose of exonerating the country of its
 obnoxious members" could be found. ⁽¹⁾

The voyages of Captain Cook had aroused a very great deal
 of interest in the Southern Pacific. Though the smaller islands
 farther east were more attractive from their tropical luxuriance,
 much attention was fixed on New South Wales, and New Zealand.
 Writing in 1787, the Right Honourable William Eden describes
 the Botany Bay project as having been "long and generally the
 subject of popular discussion". ⁽²⁾ James Maria Matra is credited
 with having suggested colonisation by loyalists to the British
 ministry. The next year New Zealand was definitely mentioned by
 Mr. Hussey M.P. as suitable for convicts. Admiral Sir George
 Young in 1785 brought the subject again to the attention of Pitt's
 Home Secretary. ⁽³⁾

This "Outline of the Many Advantages that may result to this
 Nation" from the New South Wales settlement begins with a reference
 to the extent of the country and its convenient location both

(1) Eden, (Baron Auckland) "New Holland", 1787, p.V.

(2) Ibid., p.III. Cf. Bonwick, "The First Twenty Years in
 Australia", 1882, p.3.

(3) "Facsimile of a Proposal for a Settlement on the Coast
 of New South Wales", 1785, (from a copy in the possession of the
 publishers, Angus & Robertson, Sydney) 1888. Differences are
 observable between this and the description of the plan given in
 Rose, op.cit., pt.I, pp.437-438.

for commerce with South America and as a naval base in case of another war with Spain. China, the East Indies, the Spice Islands and the Cape are all accessible. The variety of climate is enforced by enumerating a list of countries which lie in the same latitudes. There is a suggestion of protesting too much in the "nor is it mere presumption to say", with which a list of possible products is introduced. Among these the New Zealand flax plant is featured with its uses, especially in the manufacture of cordage and canvas. Friendly Islanders and Chinese would obviate the need of British emigrants, save for such mechanics as ships crews might furnish. "The American loyalists would THERE find a fertile healthy Soil, far preferable to their own". As for the convicts the penal colony suggested would reduce the cost to the government, and wholly obviate the possibility of their return. The expense of the experiment "upon the most liberal Calculation" cannot exceed £3,000. After details as to ships and personnel which the admiral making the proposal would require should he be given such a commission, it is suggested that the China ships of the East India Company could carry convicts cheaply to the colony outward bound. It is asserted that routed via the projected settlement, thence north to Formosa and Canton, the trip would be found shorter than the usual Madras and Malacca Straits course. The Company had evidently not been consulted in advance: the proposal was objected to by them. (1)

(1) The facsimile shows an endorsation to this effect in the lower right hand corner of the third (and last) page.

It is not generally recorded that the plan was widely discussed before its adoption. Yet that it was so, Eden reiterates. (1) He wrote very shortly before Captain Arthur Phillip sailed, so shortly, in fact, that he could give exact details of the equipment of the fleet, and the proposed civil establishment. He describes the maintenance of convicts at home as having been both expensive and unsatisfactory; the African project having failed, Botany Bay "bids fair to answer the wishes that have been long (2) entertained on this head by the sober part of the community". If it is viewed in the light of an experiment, the objection to a colony being founded "upon the infamous assemblage of exiled felons" (3) will be obviated. He argues that it is much better to send convicts to a land not certainly known than colonists; that the felon cannot expect "offended Justice" ---- "to seat him for (4) life on a bed of roses", and that he will have a tolerable

(1) "Every reader of every description is, from the publicity of the subject, already in possession of innumerable strictures and arguments, touching its possible advantages and disadvantages." Eden, op.cit., p.V.

(2) The report of 1 April, 1779, described the plan of a penal settlement for young convicts as "equally agreeable to the Dictates of Humanity and Sound Policy". Commons Journals, 37, p.314.

(3) Eden, op.cit., p.V. Cf. "That system of colonization" in the objection of Mr. Jekyll, Feb. 7, 1791. Parl. Hist., XXVIII, 1223. The following clauses are from the synopsis of the report of July 28, 1785: "Impossibility of forming a colony solely of convicts - 'the outcasts of an old society cannot form the foundation of a new one' - But under proper government might form a good colony." It is clear that the context alters the significance of the contained clause; yet it is quoted (as in Rose, op.cit., pt. I p.432) in isolation. See general index to "Reports", 1715-1801. The report itself says "cannot form the SOLE foundation". Commons Journal, 40, p.1162.

(4) Cf. Pitt's language. He "saw no reason to hold out a prospect of luxury to exiles".

prospect of some measure of comfort provided he amends his morals and displays industry. Eden realised the need of propitiating the East India Company. He is careful to indicate that, while its charter exists, the new colony "can never have a commerce of its own"⁽¹⁾. Citing the views held regarding the future of such a settlement he develops two thoughts characteristic of the decade's attitude to colonisation.⁽²⁾ The chief objection taken to it is that even should it seem to succeed it will be "a source of unhappiness to the parent state." The writer deplores "a precedent unknown to former times, the issue of which stands an unsurmountable objection to colonization on a large scale." This is another indication of the influence of the loss of America. The second equally typical objection is that an injustice would be done the aborigines by foisting such a settlement upon them. The historian does not venture to prophesy. He compares the proposed establishment of New South Wales with that of Virginia. To the latter "a king who affected to be a legislator" gave a charter: the former is "to be established under the wiser policy of an act of the whole British Government".⁽³⁾ He suggests, however, that with a regular government, a

(1) Eden, op.cit., p.VIII. He even suggests a law, as an additional guarantee of the Company's immunity from competition, "rendering any person possessed of property in Great Britain or Ireland disqualified from becoming possessors of fixed property in New South Wales" !

(2) Ibid., pp.8, 9.

(3) 27 Geo.III c.2 authorised a court of judicature for New South Wales.

region so extensive and so distant may produce unlooked for
 (1)
 results.

Even as a penal colony the success of the experiment was for some years in doubt. On December 5, 1788 the Recorder of London consulted with Lord Sydney regarding the overcrowding of prisons in the metropolis. (2) The season was then over for despatching ships with convicts to the British colonies in America, but it was understood that two would be sent in March following. In that month the first news from Botany Bay was received. (3) The reports were not altogether satisfactory. Nor were they two years later when the question was again raised in the House of Commons. On that occasion (4) Sir Charles Bunbury, years before the author of an act facilitating the construction of penitentiaries by counties, again advocated prison reform on Howard's principles. He understood that the transportation of criminals to the antipodes had proved disappointing owing to the sterility of the soil. Pitt denied the authenticity of the report. He defended the attempt as the cheapest handling of prisoners which could be found.

(1) An opinion which suggests even in its language the answer made by (Sir) Joseph Banks to the committee which reported 1 April, 1779. He had been asked if any advantage could be looked for from the founding of a convict colony at Botany Bay, Commons Journals, 37, p.311.

(2) Gentleman's Magazine, 1788, 58, p.1116.

(3) Ibid., 1789, 59, p.273.

(4) February 9, 1791. Parl. Hist., XXVIII, 1221 ff.

The plane on which the prime minister dealt with what proved to be the founding of one of the bastions of empire was not a high one. Many in Britain took a more elevated view of the experiment in penal servitude. Opinion was aroused to the state of the prisons; it was informed concerning the need for some outlet for malefactors. Transportation to Africa was too inhuman, but transportation was better than the hulks. New Holland struck the imagination. There, it appeared the wrong-doer might have another chance. The intervention of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars cut off opinion on the subject. In later years, conditions in the meantime having become worse at home, and seemingly better in the far-distant colony, protests were not wanting to the effect that England had provided for her convicts more humanely than for her law-abiding citizens.

(1) See Rose, "Pitt", pt.I, p.442, for the lack of imperial imagination that statesman displayed.

(2) The prejudice against "chain-gang" labour entered. See Eden to Burke, March 18, 1776. "Correspondence", op.cit., II, p.94. Eden had submitted for Burke's criticism the heads of a bill, endorsed by Sir William Blackstone and other judges, for employing convicts at home, and giving them a small gratuity upon discharge. Burke's strong objections to penal labour within the country can be read between the lines of Eden's reply, cited above.

(3) Bannister, "British Colonization and Coloured Tribes", 1838, p.158, attributes to the interposition of the African merchants, the prevention of "a frightful project for sending convicts to West Africa". He gives the date as 1780. The part played by Burke as the spokesman of humanity in 1785 has been shown.

The classical illustration of the determination of policy by eighteenth century opinion is found in the abolition of the slave trade. Outstanding as it is, in the general^{relation} of what the great mass of the people willed to what the ruling class performed, this manifestation of effective opinion is absolutely unique from the point of view of this study, colonial policy. In so far as it is a question of home affairs it is of interest here only as a further evidence of the potency of opinion. But the distinction between that phase of the movement which is essentially domestic, and that which regards the colonies more particularly is made with extreme difficulty. It is the distinction between action which is self-regarding, and that in which another is primarily concerned, over again. The reference may, indeed, have its value. In the twentieth century the line of demarcation in many imperial matters is perfectly clear: a question is for the handling of one or other of the over-seas dominions: or it is for the United Kingdom's consideration. In the later eighteenth century, colonial interests were hardly realised as existing in and for themselves. The refusal to recognise this involved the disintegration of "the project of an empire"; its recognition is partially conceded, reluctantly and with reservations, in the concession of a constitution to the Canadas; again it is refused, almost categorically, in the denial of West Indian interests by the re-assertion of the mercantile hegemony of the mother country. Even in the case of the slave trade, where elevated sentiments of justice and humanity were finding

expression in the overthrow of a disgraceful institution, the interests of the colonies as seen by themselves, were disregarded. Britain broke with the pernicious traditions of the African trade with little thought of the interests of the slave colonies. It is true that the ruin of the islands was the chief argument of the protagonists of the traffic in slave labour: but that ruin was deplored as a forerunner of disaster at home.

In treating of the agitation, then, which resulted in the abandonment by the Parliament of Great Britain on the part of her nationals of the trade in slaves, attention will be fixed on but two aspects of the movement - the definiteness with which a predetermined end was worked towards through the systematic development of public opinion, and, in so far as the distinction is possible, the more particularly colony-regarding aspects of the question.

It is interesting, first, to note that among the earliest voices raised against the unchristian practices of the slave trade were those of Englishmen who had witnessed what they reprobated in the Barbadoes. Richard Baxter, the celebrated nonconformist, George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, and William Edmundson, his fellow-traveller, appealed directly to planters in those islands to ameliorate, especially by religious instruction, the condition of their slaves. ⁽¹⁾ These contemporaries, Baxter in his Directory, Fox to his auditors in the

(1) Clarkson, "The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-trade", 2 vols. 1808, I, pp.46-47; 110-112.

Barbadoes in 1671, and Edmundson like St. Paul before Festus to the Governor himself, appealed to the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. For long the horrors of the trade were not generally known in the home country. In the colonies self-interest gave the question, as it does the relation of white and coloured today, quite another appearance. Colonial abhorrence of slavery was confined to the non-slave -holding states. There, the year of the skirmish at Lexington saw the institution of a Society whose aim was abolition. ⁽¹⁾ In 1772, a petition of the burgesses of Virginia had been presented to His Majesty praying the removal of the restraints on the Governor of that colony which prevented his assenting to the anti slave-trade enactments of the local legislature. Its refusal was afterwards cited as a reason for the colonial rebellion. ⁽²⁾

It is not strange that Britain was without knowledge of the horrors of the middle passage. Had Liverpool been a slave depot as well as a centre of slave shipping the facts had been bruited early. While some had misgivings ⁽³⁾ regarding English participation in a traffic the main outlines of which the uninstructed imagination could supply, others engaged in it without thought of offence. And of these latter some were men of intensely religious

(1) In Pennsylvania, a "union of the Quakers with others". Clarkson, op.cit., I, p.188.

(2) Ibid., pp.185 - 6.

(3) E.g. Lady Hawkins in Kingsley's "Westward Ho!" Note that regarding the earliest English slave-trading that Sir John, "in spite of his religiosity, was by no means a 'consistent walker';" and that the Queen was "sharp with him for pity of the poor wretches."

(1) instincts. What was imperative was that the Mosaic dispensation which saw no necessary connection between true religion and such barbarity should be transcended by a new gospel. This was the evangel to be proclaimed by Granville Sharp, Clarkson, and Wilberforce. The way was prepared by the Quakers; the proclamation of the message gave practical employment to the Evangelical Movement.

It was the practice of bringing slaves to England which drew attention to their woes. In this the planters undid their own cause. A pronouncement of the law officers of the crown in 1729 that neither landing in Britain nor baptism freed a West Indian slave was questioned in Granville Sharp's book
(2) forty years later. In the case of Somersett, Lord Mansfield, having delayed judgment for three terms without being able to effect a compromise between the parties, reluctantly established for all time the freedom-giving properties of British soil.
(3) This delay and reluctance regarding the demands of humanity in conflict with the rights of property is a presage of what the attitude of Parliament was to be. The generous energy of the most retiring of men, Granville Sharp, on behalf of individual

(1) Especially John Newton, afterwards a leader of the Evangelicals, who, in command of a slaver, enjoyed "sweeter and more frequent hours of divine communion", than he had elsewhere known. Cf. Stephen, "The English Utilitarians", I, p.114.

(2) "A Representation of the Injustice and dangerous Tendency of tolerating slavery in England". Clarkson, op.cit., p 71.

(3) XX, State Trials, I, Judgment pronounced June 22, 1772

blacks in England was a worthy basis for unselfish propaganda. The Quakers had long since laid it down for members of their society that complicity with the nefarious trade would involve being disowned.⁽¹⁾ Novelists and poets had begun to make the sufferings of negroes their theme. In the year in which John Wesley's powerful pamphlet, "Thoughts on Slavery", was published, an abstract resolution declaring the trade "contrary to the laws of God and the rights of man" was moved and seconded in the House of Commons by Mr. David Hartley and Sir George Savile. The historian of the abolition movement rejoiced that those who first raised the question there were men "to whom no motive of party or faction could be imputed".⁽²⁾ In his reprobation of the traffic, Paley had suggested that "the great revolution, which has taken place in the western world, may probably conduce to accelerate the fall of this abominable tyranny".⁽³⁾ 1783 saw renewed activity to that end in England.

A bill being before Parliament for the regulating of the African trade in June, the body of Quakers, from their annual assembly, addressed a petition to the House of Commons praying that the restriction to be imposed upon officers of the African Company, prohibiting them from exporting negroes, be extended

(1) 1761. The yearly meeting had censured the trade in 1727. Clarkson, op.cit., I, pp.111-115.

(2) Ibid., I, p.85. This was in 1774.

(3) Paley, op.cit., I, (Bk.III, pt. II, ch.3.) p.236, continuing the questions "whether a legislature which has so long lent its assistance to the support of an institution replete with human misery, was fit to be trusted with an empire the most extensive that ever obtained in any age or quarter of the globe".

(1)

to all British subjects whatsoever. Concomitantly certain underwriters instituted a suit at the Guildhall which brought to light an unparalleled atrocity. Captain Collingwood of the ship "Zong" for the purpose of saving the owners of his cargo from the loss which disease threatened, had thrown overboard alive one hundred and thirty-two slaves. The facts were admitted: scarcity of water was alleged, but not proven. Sharp had a shorthand writer on hand to take down the proceedings. In February of this year the Bishop of Chester, preaching to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, had been most severe in his strictures on British regulations of slavery and the slave trade. Dr. Porteus

(2)

acknowledged the Reverend James Ramsay who had been nineteen years in St. Christopher as the source of his information. It is significant of the union which simple humanity could effect between religious bodies even in that age that the sermon in question was printed ⁽³⁾ for free distribution by a committee of Quakers.

This first group of abolitionists numbered six. They set before themselves the definite object of converting the general public to the necessity of parliamentary interposition. The

(1) Parl. Hist., XXIII, 1026. The Gentleman's Magazine 53, p.534, reporting the presentation of the petition, refers to the trade as "calling loudly for the humane interposition of the legislature".

(2) His 1784 pamphlet started the first public controversy. His contribution throughout was of great importance.

(3) Very sympathetically reviewed in the Gentleman's Magazine, 53, p.859. Dr. Porteus showed how badly British slaves were treated as compared with French and Danish.

London and provincial press, and the free pamphlet were to be the means to that enlightenment.⁽¹⁾ Meanwhile a standing committee of the general body of Quakers was launching a similar campaign. It sent copies of a pamphlet setting forth its view of the slave trade to the members of the royal family, the great officers of state, the peers of the realm, and the members of the House of Commons. Twelve thousand copies of "The Case" were printed for distribution in 1784. Similarly, the next year, an authoritative American publication was circulated.⁽²⁾ Public bodies, the clergy, and the foremost schools of the country were asked to take copies. Deputations were sent, in most instances, to back the request. It was as a travelling secretary and publicity agent in such a modern effort to arouse public opinion as this, and for such faithful painstaking workers, that Thomas Clarkson effected so much for the cause of abolition.

His story is familiar. Influenced by the logic of his own prize-winning essay on the slave trade,⁽³⁾ he meditated a single-handed attack on the general ignorance concerning its unthinkable inhumanity. When he sought a publisher for an English translation of his Latin dissertation, he was introduced to this Quaker

(1) Before the end of the year "they had secured a place in the General Evening Post, in Lloyd's Evening Post, in the Norwich, Bath, York, Bristol, Sherborne, Liverpool, Newcastle, and other provincial papers, for such articles as they chose to send them". Clarkson, op.cit., I, p.125.

(2) Anthony Benezet's "A Caution to Great Britain and her Colonies, in a short representation of the calamitous State of the enslaved Negroes in the British Dominions". Cf. Clarkson, op.cit., I, p.122.

(3) Cambridge, 1785. Clarkson pays tribute to the Vice-chancellor, Dr. Peckard, who gave out the subject, "Anne liceat Invitos in Servitutem dare?"

committee of six. They were already in touch with Granville Sharp and the Reverend James Ramsay. Their purpose was one. He gave his whole time to the work of making known what he knew and of learning more: they met him weekly in committee meeting for consultation and mutual encouragement.

Clarkson got his facts from slavers in the Thames and from the muster-rolls of ships in the Customs house. From the latter he compiled a record of twenty thousand seamen. He was soon able to prove that instead of being a nursery of seamen the slave trade was their grave. He early met Wilberforce,⁽¹⁾ and from the first esteemed him as a force to be depended upon in the legislature. Clarkson used his friends; they all did: in that, too, the protagonists of a hundred and fifty years ago were decidedly modern. Bennet Langton,⁽²⁾ the associate of Johnson, Reynolds and Burke, known and esteemed at court, lent his assistance in distributing Clarkson's book. The members of Parliament interviewed "professed themselves friendly", but rather "from the emotion of good hearts" ----- "than from any knowledge" of the facts of the case.⁽³⁾

(1) It was the year before this that Wilberforce found new, constraining implications in religion. In view of the criticism to which Clarkson was later subjected, it seems only right to testify that a very careful study of his history fails to justify the charge of slighting the part played by Wilberforce in the abolition of the slave trade.

(2) There is no suggestion of party in Clarkson's book. Cf. Dr. Cunningham "Growth of English Industry and Commerce", II, pp. 607, 608.

(3) Clarkson, op.cit., pp.239, 240. One, Mr. Powys, doubted certain facts in Clarkson's essay, in particular, the incident of the ship "Zong". Granville Sharp's court notes enforced the truth. So were firm supporters won.

On May 22, 1787, the group of philanthropists in the city, assured of Wilberforce's co-operation, organised themselves for still more active work. The committee numbered twelve, all but three being Quakers. At a meeting held shortly after, it was determined to distinguish between the slave trade and slavery, and to aim at the discontinuance of the former. (1) For that reason they styled themselves "The Committee organised in June 1787, for effecting the Abolition of the Slave-trade". The spirit in which they worked for full twenty years rather suggests a fitness in the fact that this message of good-will was proclaimed by a group of twelve. (2)

Clarkson began his tours. In Bristol he found considerable familiarity with the trade. "Every-body seemed to execrate it, though no one thought of its abolition." (3) He had all the introductions throughout Great Britain that could assist him. (4) The Dean of Gloucester introduced him to Robert Raikes whose press was subsequently at the disposal of the committee. Liverpool

(1) One argument to this end brought out what was felt to be a difficulty with the colonies. Briefly, that while the government could, and did, control "trade", there was no certainty that it could ensure the observance "in the heart of the islands" of an act against slavery.

(2) See list in Clarkson, *op.cit.*, I, p.256. Other members were elected from time to time, Josiah Wedgwood very shortly, Wilberforce not until 1794.

(3) Clarkson, *op.cit.*, p.296.

(4) When lists were being made out by the London committee of persons in the country to whom publications could be entrusted for distribution, it was found that they had personal friends in no less than thirty-nine counties. And these were not only believed to be willing but also "qualified on the account of their judgment and the weight of their character" to serve a useful part. Clarkson, *op.cit.*, pp.444-445.

Liverpool furnished him with telling arguments. So hostile did the disposition of the trade towards him become that his life was endangered. Occasionally he found advocates of the cause working in ignorance of the existence of a metropolitan committee. Everywhere he stimulated the well-disposed to activity, suggesting the establishment of local committees and tentative steps towards drafting petitions to Parliament. Returned to London he found offers of help pouring in. From France, Brissot and Lafayette had written: at home Archdeacon Paley and the Dean of Middleham, Dr. Price and Major Cartwright, Charles Wyvill, and John Wesley, men of all ranks and persuasions, sent their arguments with offers of assistance. Wesley, in a characteristic letter, exhorting them to diligence and perseverance, recommended "that the question should be argued as well upon the consideration of interest as of humanity and justice, the former of which he feared would have more weight than the latter"⁽¹⁾. His caution against being over sanguine had already been tendered by Bennet Langton.

As the year 1788 opened the situation promised well. To satisfy the demand for abolitionist literature, "the press was kept in constant employ". Among others, the "Thoughts on the African Slave Trade", of the reformed slaver captain, John Newton, now rector of St. Mary Woolnoth in London, was printed. On February 11, the Order-in-Council instituting a Privy Council inquiry into the African trade was issued. Clarkson had seen Pitt. That

(1) His second letter to the committee, Clarkson, op.cit., I, p. 451 - 2.

That statesman's attitude is of great interest. At the first interview he had been of the opinion that the interest of the owner in the well-being of the slave would prevent the gross cruelty reported, had doubted the extent to which disease and and death claimed seamen in the trade, and had discounted the capacity of Africa to afford commodities of rich commercial value of a legitimate nature. Clarkson's list of authorities for tales of cruelty, backed by the "mouth-openers" used on negroes who preferred death by starvation to servitude, convinced the Prime Minister on the first score. Copies of the muster-rolls supported the second, while the collection of African productions, — woods, spices, cotton, with articles of native workmanship surprised and interested him. (1) Time was to show that the possibilities of an Africa opened to civilisation and the world's commerce had fired his imagination. (2)

Wilberforce's illness alone damped the hopes of the reformers until the opening of the Privy Council's investigation, and the hearing of the advocates of the traffic began to influence opinion, especially in higher circles. The tenor of this first evidence was that the transportation of the wretched inhabitants of Africa to the West Indies was really a blessing in disguise, and that the middle passage was "one of the happiest periods in

(1) Clarkson, op.cit., I, pp.472 - 4. In Grenville the abolitionist found "a warm feeling on behalf of the injured African". p. 475.

(2) Parl. Hist., XXIX, 1134 - 58.; Wilberforce, III, p. 32.

a negro's life". Just what was the instigating cause of the dancing they were reported to indulge in was to come out later. How Pitt substituted for Wilberforce, moving with the support of Fox and Burke that the House pledge itself to take the matter up next session, ⁽¹⁾ and how the motion was carried unanimously is familiar history. Sir William Dolben's bill to establish limits ^{over-} beyond which crowding should not be practised on slavers was carried 56 - 5, the first division on the question. Thurlow's insurgency jeopardised its safety in the Lords. Despite his tirade against "this five days fit of philanthropy" the measure ⁽²⁾ was approved.

The thirteen and a half months which ended with the conclusion of the Session in July 1788 had been strenuous ones for the business-men who comprised the members of the Anti-slave Trade committee. To indicate how energetically they had been working as philanthropists in creating opinion, it is worth citing that in that time fifty-one committee meetings were held, meetings which usually lasted from six to eleven p.m. In that period, too, 26,526 accounts of debates and smaller papers such as circular

(1) Pitt was criticised by Fox at the time, and by many later, for not expressing his own views. The Privy Council enquiry was still proceeding. The use he made of its report when it was available surely justifies his conduct here. On his whole attitude see R.I. & S. Wilberforce, "Life of Wilberforce", 5 vols. 1838, III, pp. 178, 184. Also Clarkson, op.cit., I, pp. 524-6; II, 503-506; Also Rose, op.cit., pt. I, pp. 459-460; 477-478; II, 502-503; also Wraxall, op.cit., V, pp. 139, 141, 148, 149. Pitt's words, April 27, 1792, "I feel the infamy of the Trade so heavily, the impolicy of it so clearly, that I am ashamed I have not been able to convince the House to abandon it altogether in an instant". Parl. Hist. XXIX 1279.

(2) Wraxall, op.cit., V, p. 145.

letters were printed and carefully distributed, while 51,432 pamphlets and books were similarly placed to advantage.⁽¹⁾ The country had responded strongly. One hundred and three petitions in favour of abolition had been presented during the session, among them those from the City of London, despite its commercial interests, the two Universities, large manufacturing towns and whole counties.⁽²⁾ The Church, it is true, was lukewarm, but individual bishops, and many of the clergy had transcended the conventions of the day in eager co-operation with Quakers and Dissenters.⁽³⁾ The society Amis des Noirs had been formed in Paris.

To secure witnesses willing to go before the Privy Council was a difficult task. Clarkson found many who knew the facts and sympathised with the cause, but whom fear of estranging a West Indian relative, or of alienating patrons or clients, deterred. Employees of government hesitated when it was seen that the cabinet was divided on the question. The King's illness intervened when abolitionist witnesses were being examined, with the consequence that only a third of those gathered with such difficulty were heard. When the large folio volume which constituted the report of the Privy Council was available, Pitt was able to

(1) Clarkson, op.cit., I, pp.571, 572; details of printing are given pp.113, 236, 438, 459, 462, 497.

(2) Ibid. pp. 491, 492.

(3) Ibid. p.572.

deduce from its pages the perfect safety of abolition, — "that
 "not only could the islands go on in a flourishing state without
 "supplies from the coast of Africa, but that they were then in a
 (1)
 "condition to do it".

Meanwhile the opposition arguments were making insidious way with members of Parliament. A subsidised press urged that slaves were better off in the West Indies; that, animal-like, they suffered little from punishment; that abolition was absurd and abolitionists visionaries; that their real aim was emancipation, which meant massacre for the whites; that planters whose lives and property were threatened deserved pity as well as the blacks; that the ruin of the islands would bring in its train the ruin of commerce, the revenue and the navy; that all that was needed was the regulation of the traffic, which the colonial legislatures, knowing the situation better, could better provide; lastly, that, if abolition were enacted £70,000,000 would be necessary to indemnify the merchants and planters for the losses they would inevitably suffer. On May 12, 1789, Wilberforce addressed a House already half-alienated.

His speech of three and a half hours was a masterly review of the facts. Having shown the rapine the trade wrought in Africa, and the joys of the middle passage — where the euphemism "dancing" meant leaping in irons, exercise to which the slave whip furnished the incentive, he demonstrated that natural reproduction

(1) Clarkson, op.cit., II, p.40. Cf. Parl. Hist., XXIX, 339

would supply the needs of labour in the islands. How much modern methods of tillage would avail the planter he proved by evidence of their own furnishing. Finally he made it clear both that the naval strength of Britain suffered from the trade (of 910 men in the trade the previous year, 216 had died); and that the ships involved clearing ^{outwards} from Liverpool constituted only 13,000 tons as compared with the total 170,000 of the port. He concluded by moving twelve propositions based on the Privy Council report.

The opposition had not imagined that any such damaging facts would be supported by that enquiry. They now demanded that witnesses be examined by the House of Commons. Clarkson had to gather his evidence again. It was essential that facts should be forthcoming regarding the methods by which slaves were procured. Native canoes set off up-stream from the mouth of such rivers as the Calabar. The abolitionists had good reason to believe that they simply foraged for them among the weaker tribes. An informant advised the representative of the committee that he had talked a year before to a sailor who could confirm their suspicions. His name was unknown: the only clue to his identity was a general description and the surmise that he was on a "ship of war in ordinary"⁽¹⁾. Clarkson set out. From Deptford to Woolwich, Chatham, Sheerness, Portsmouth, boarding all the ships of war lying in ordinary and enquiring. At Plymouth

(1) That is, out of commission. Isaac Parker proved to be the name of the much-wanted witness. Clarkson, op.cit., II, pp. 169 - 173.

he found him, on the fifty-seventh ship searched in the tour, a man with a good record who had sailed with Captain Cook. Such testimony was badly needed. The tide was beginning to turn against the abolitionists. The session of 1789 - 1890 was occupied with the examination of witnesses by a committee of the Commons. Among these those supporting the slave trade predominated in number. A distinction was made invidiously between the walks of life represented by those ^{who} testified for the planters as compared with the supporters of abolition, — as admirals to A.Bs, it was said. ⁽¹⁾ In a more important respect there was a difference. The evidence advanced by the anti-slave trade workers was positive: the best their opponents could contribute was that they individually had not seen such and such things happen. The cause continued to gain with the public, but in the lobbies of Parliament the rights of property had already begun to take on that sacrosanct character with which they were invested for more than a generation. Paine had written on behalf of abolition, but the appearance of his "Rights of Man" probably much more than undid the helpful influence of his articles. The negroes of San Domingo had revolted, massacring many of the whites. From Martinique and the smaller French islands the contagion spread to Dominica.

On April 18, 1791, Wilberforce again presented the arguments for abolition. The atrocities which he recounted had taken place since he had dealt so eloquently with the subject two years

(1) Cf. Edwards, op.cit., II, p. 114.

before. Humanity failed to reach the ears which heard only the false accents of a spurious policy. Pitt contended that the proposal was not impolitic. In an extremely able speech ⁽¹⁾ closely reasoned, he demonstrated that the negro population of the islands could be maintained without further importations. Statistics showed that at the moment the deaths practically equalled the births. It was notorious that great numbers of these occurred during the initial three months' seasoning. The opposition had consistently urged the disproportion of males as accounting for the lack of natural increase. It was clear that to discontinue the importations would do away with deaths during the acclimatisation period: it would also, gradually but completely correct the predominance of one sex. It would of itself powerfully stimulate the owner to care for the health of his labourers. Fox endorsed Pitt's arguments. He found that the wastage of life in the West Indies was the great basis on which the retention of the trade was advocated. To him it was the strongest of reasons for abolition. It was unavailing. The motion was lost by 163 to 88. The only comfort the abolition committee could draw from the session was the legislative approval won for the Sierra Leone Company.

(1) Professor Holland Rose rather glosses over the effect of this speech. Cf. "Life of William Pitt", pt. I, p.476. "Parl. Hist." XXIX, 335 - 343. It was still strong upon Fox when fifteen years later he once more spoke on the question, that is on June 10, 1806. See Cobbett's "Parl. Debates", VII, 584, where the speech commended is assigned, obviously in error, to Burke. Cf. the eulogy in Clarkson's version II, pp.510, 511.

The abolition committee was anything but prepared to give up the struggle. They knew what the general public felt. "Of the enthusiasm of the nation at this time none can form an opinion but they who witnessed it,"⁽¹⁾ writes the chronicler of the agitation. The latter abridged the evidence for abolition to one volume, and again toured the country seeing it wisely distributed. He found that some 300,000 people were expressing their abhorrence of slavery by foregoing sugar.⁽²⁾ Local committees were still springing up, Newcastle, Nottingham and Glasgow organising them during this period. Scotland had seldom been so unanimous as she was in the cause of the negroes. "From January to May 1792, the advertisement columns of the newspapers teemed with resolutions in favour of the anti-slavery crusade."⁽³⁾ Of 524 petitions presented to Parliament during the session, 519 were for abolition.

On April 2, 1792, Wilberforce again moved that the trade "ought to be abolished". The opposition shifted their ground. Dundas, in a speech of doubtful sincerity, moved to insert the word "gradually".⁽⁴⁾ Addington and Jenkinson supported him. Fox at once declared the manoeuvre as suspicious. Pitt cited 23 Geo.II

(1) Clarkson, op.vit., II, p.352.

(2) Ibid. p.350.

(3) Meikle, "Scotland and the French Revolution", 1912, p.77.

(4) Parl. Hist. XXIX, 1104 -1110; 1124.

c.31, upon which the greatest stress had been laid as legalising the traffic, and showed that the conditions as stated in the preamble which necessitated the commerce in slaves no longer existed. It was now neither advantageous to Britain nor necessary to the planters. The act⁽¹⁾ itself provided penalties for "fraud, force or violence" such as characterised the whole trade. He was eloquent for abolition as a measure of simple justice, as a policy of the merest prudence, as a means to the opening of Africa to legitimate intercourse with European civilisation. Again interest, trepidation, uncertainty won the day. Dundas carried the majority into the lobby with him for "gradual" abolition. Later in the month, 1796 was determined on as the date for the discontinuance of slave-carrying by British subjects.

It was not to be. Philanthropy had become too exactly synonymous with Jacobinism. The King, who had once favoured humane interposition by the legislature, now refused his support to a measure advocated by men whom he regarded as dangerous incendiaries.⁽²⁾ Pitt was constrained to make overtures to the⁽³⁾

(1) Clause XXIX, — "No master of a ship trading to Africa shall by fraud, force, or violence, or by any indirect method whatever, take on board or carry away from that coast any negro or native of that country, or commit any violence on the natives to the prejudice of the said trade; and every person so offending shall for every such offence forfeit one hundred pounds". Cf. Pitt's speech, "Parl.Hist." XXIX, 1134 - 1138.

(2) "Wilberforce", p.163, "Its failure in 1792 had been occasioned by a fear of French principles which the conduct of some leading advocates at home had too much countenanced", meaning in particular, Clarkson.

(3) Cf. Dictionary of National Biography, "George III",; The Political History of England, X, (1760 - 1801 by W.Hunt) p.323. Paine was an abolitionist. Clarkson had spoken publicly in support of natural rights in the French sense. In 1793 he wrote Wilberforce "I do not imagine that we could meet with twenty persons in Hull
B.T.O.

moderate Whigs. A concession regarding the slave trade seems to have been included. In the month in which France declared war, the House of Commons refused even to stand by their resolution of the previous year for gradual abolition. Probably none foresaw how long the postponement of justice was destined to be.

The decade had none the less demonstrated that public opinion was capable of being created and used to achieve a parliamentary purpose. Dolben's bill had been forced on selfish interests. Amended annually it had been possible to add to it clauses which ensured a measure of justice and humanity for the seamen employed by the slave-dealers. Again, the contention that negroes were less than human had been tacitly abandoned in the light thrown on their essential nature by their champions. ⁽¹⁾

Still more significant, the nation, and, even in 1793, Parliament, had been convinced that no disaster to the colonial interests of the country need necessarily be associated with the discontinuance of the slave-trade. The change of front by the opposition in the previous year was a confession that they could no longer maintain that certain ruin would follow abolition. John Wesley had enjoined upon the anti-slave trade committee the advisability of stressing the argument of interest for the prohibition of the trade.

Clarkson's "Essay on the Impolicy of the Slave-trade" was based so exclusively on official documents that no answer was attempted. ⁽²⁾

at present who would sign a petition (demanding abolition) that are not Republicans. People connect Democratical Principles with the Abolition of the Slave Trade and will not hear it mentioned."

(1) Clarkson, op.cit., II, p.254.

(2) The opposition writers "never even made an attempt to answer it". Ibid., I, p.567.

But it was Pitt's speech of 1791 which established for the House of Commons the safety of abolition from the point of view
(1)
of policy.

So far the question of the anti-slave trade agitation has been considered as an outstanding manifestation of the influence of opinion in policy. It remains to investigate the extent to which the policy so influenced was colonial. It will also be important to glance at the attitude of Britain at large to the question 'qua' colonial.

One speaker ventured to assert that upon the African trade
(2)
hung the West Indian and upon that the Newfoundland trade. Such a view tended to suggest that, its implications in the islands notwithstanding, the subject was one to be dealt with irrespective of the attitude of the colonists to it. Yet Lord Sheffield, who had given such unmistakable proof, in connection with the interdiction of West Indian -American commerce, that he held the mother country justified in any mercantile restriction of the planters, was definitely of the opinion that the abolition of the slave
(3)
trade would be ultra vires of the British Parliament.

This conflict of opinion between advocates of the trade is typical. It would be safe to say that not one writer or speaker in ten regarded the question as one in which the colonists, merely

(1) Cf. Cunningham, *op.cit.*, II, 608, note 2.

(2) Mr. Alderman Watson. "Parl. Hist." XXIX, 343; Clarkson, *op.cit.*, II, p.317.

(3) "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, 359; Clarkson, *op.cit.*, II, p.336.

as colonists, should have a voice. Of the two the abolitionists were the greater offenders — if it was an offence to consider it a problem for legislation at St. Stephens exclusively. Cowper had asked — the Somerset finding of Lord Mansfield in mind,

(1)

"We have no Slaves at home - then why abroad?"

Exactly so, most, almost all, of the champions of the negro regarded the matter. Lord Belgrave, for example, would have British justice done in the west as in the east. That is, the rights of the King-in-parliament in the West Indies were regarded as being identical with those exercised in India. Mr. Windham — speaking on this occasion for immediate abolition — looked upon the question as one of national morality. He hoped the West Indians would concede the necessity of the mother country's point of view. On still another ground Wilberforce urged downright metropolitan action, simply that colonial laws for the protection of the slave were dead letters. This was a significant position to take. It implied unquestioned sovereignty on the part of the home authorities. It was a position which verged on that adopted so disastrously towards the late continental colonies. In another respect abolitionist opinion took the old regrettable attitude: it did not discriminate between planter and planter;

(1) "Works", ed. Gilfillan, 2 vols. 1854, II, "The Task", bk.II, p.209.

(2) Clarkson, op.cit., I, p.545.

(3) "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, 1256-1259; Clarkson, op.cit. II, p.457

(4) Adam Smith, op.cit., II, p.167, shows that this was almost inevitable. "The respect which he (the magistrate) is obliged to pay to the master, renders it more difficult for him to protect the slave". Clarkson, op.cit., II, p.228.

all tended to be regarded as cruel, even to inhumanity, because of the brutal conduct of individuals among their number. Zeal outran fair play. That it should be so was inevitable. To abhor inhumanity was a virtue. The sense of virtue, as a mental anaesthetic, prevented a fastidious discrimination between the doer and the deed. (1) Planters came to be regarded as yet another species of the unsavoury genus, colonist.

The protagonists of the status quo made more frequent reference to the rights of the colonists. These references cannot be taken at their face value: the premium on argument was too great. It suited the purposes of the merchants interested in the trade to urge that Britain had by a want of prudent conduct lost America, (2) and to suggest that the islands might be driven into independence by a similar disregard of local rights. (3) Mr. Dempster and Sir William Yonge (4) were among the fairest and acutest of the advocates of the existing system. Yet the former conceded "that sugar could be raised cheaper by free men than by slaves". (5) The

(1) Cf. the speech of Mr. Vaughan, a West Indian property holder, but not a friend of slavery, for a defence of the planters generally. "Parl. Hist." XXIX, 1083-1087, 1090,

(2) Mr. Drake, "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, 358; Cf. Clarkson, II, p.336.

(3) "One of the most conscientious men who ever sat in Parliament, elevated above all party views and proverbial for candour". M.P. for Forfar Burghs. He defended Hastings. Wraxall, op.cit., IV, p.339. Clarkson, op.cit., II, pp.90, 91.

(4) Sir William Young (sic) was broad-minded enough to support the Sierra Leone Settlement Bill. "Parl.Hist." XXIX, p.653. Clarkson, op.cit., II, p.276, "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, p.305, "leading our colonists ----- instead of rudely forcing them.".

(5) See next page.

latter urged the most valid objection to Pitt's proof that the islands could supply their own needs in negro labour, pointing out that the gradation of ages was not yet filled. The one objected to "schemes of benevolence to the detriment of other people", still more "to see them going to the colonies, as it were upon their estates, and prescribing rules to them for their management." The other maintained that sudden abolition will be an unjust interference, oppression of the colonies. "The legislatures there should be led, and not forced."

These four anti-abolitionists, Lord Sheffield, Sir W. Yonge, Messrs. Drake and Dempster, may have been sincerely concerned for colonial rights. Their words seem to indicate an appreciation of the question as having at least an aspect essentially colonial and for colonial consideration only. However that may be, the argument they used in common was not generally advanced by their colleagues. Planters' rights were urged as being equally based with British rights. One speaker repeating this dictum gave away the sense in which he used it, by adding that, indeed, the planters spent their fortunes in Britain. If Briton and West Indian stood on the same footing, the addition that the rights of the latter were British rights by reason of his English domicile was not only redundant but suspicious. Generally slave insurrections were prophesied by the friends of the planters. The Duke of

(5) "Parl. Hist.", XXVIII, 77. Cf. Adam Smith, op.cit., I, p.72, "because the cost of up-keep falls on the slave-owner, not on the employer of free labour, who hires another if the first fall ill." II, p.269, because slavery is unprogressive; the free labourer only finds an incentive to invention. Cf. 269, note. - This positive argument for abolition was comparatively neglected by Wilberforce; Pitt amplified the negative aspect of it, that abolition was not necessarily impolitic. Hence that justice should have its course.

Chandos submitted that the very agitation of the question would prove an instigating cause to revolt. Here was concern for Englishmen resident in the islands. How much was it concern for English capital invested there?

Adam Smith makes a distinction between the French and English sugar islands which is relevant in this connection. The former flourished on a stock which had been made and remade on the spot. The latter languished, relatively speaking, on capital which might be said to have overflowed from the United Kingdom. The West Indies then, were so largely British in their working capital, so uniformly were estates there mortgaged at home, so universally did planters absent themselves from their island holdings to live in English homes, that it was with difficulty that they could be thought of as having an identity apart truly colonial. It is this series of facts which, to a large extent, vitiates the value of comparisons which may be instituted between public opinion and West Indian policy and the same determining sanction and general colonial policy.

The planters themselves did not make a consistent stand on their rights as colonists. It is true that their meetings not infrequently manifested "warmth and virulence", and that "propositions breathing a spirit of anger" were adopted. "It was suggested there in the vehemence of passion", says Clarkson, "that

(1) "Wealth of Nations", (ed. J.E.T. Rogers) II, p.168.

(2) "Generally speaking, the sugar planters are but so many agents or stewards for their creditors and annuitants in the mother country". Edwards, op.cit., II, p.431.

the Islands could exist independently of the Mother-country";⁽¹⁾
 nor were even threats withheld to intimidate government from
 effecting the abolition". But such ground was not taken in
 Parliament. Bryan Edwards, who reviewed the situation soberly
 and from the planters' point of view in 1793, was decidedly
 averse to the assertion of the existence of a distinct colonial
 interest.⁽²⁾ He reprobated the alleged visionary proposals of the
 abolitionists. He refuted the calumnies circulated against West
 Indian slave-owners as a class. He defended the efforts of the
 legislature of Jamaica to do justice to the slave.⁽³⁾ He acknow-
 ledged the needless cruelty and rapine on the coast of Africa.⁽⁴⁾
 He urged that "An Act for the more easy recovery of debts in His
 Majesty's plantations"⁽⁵⁾ put a premium on the break-up of negro
 families. He contended with evident reason for restricting the
 slave to the soil as the villein had been. To this end he intro-

(1) "Abolition of the Slave-trade", II, p.34.

(2) See above p.116.

(3) He quotes "the highest approbation" expressed by the Privy Council report of the Clause requiring overseers "to answer upon oath". In appendix I to book 4, p.151, he gives the consolidated slave act of Jamaica (March 2, 1792) with the amendments since 1788 in italics.

(4) Edwards, op.cit., II, pp. 106, 107, 142. His candour deserves credit. Wilberforce appreciated it.

(5) 5 Geo.II c.7. In the repeal of this Lord Sheffield had found a means of correcting the cruelty his "Observations on American Commerce" criticised. Mr. Milnes, who followed him in debate on 19 April, 1791, commented significantly on the noble lord's change of views on becoming member for Bristol. "Parl. Hist" XXIX, 359.

duced a measure into the Jamaican Assembly. There was perhaps some point in his bitter comment that English humanity was blind to an obvious reform since its accomplishment had too directly jeopardised the position of English creditors. He showed how seriously the interdiction of trade with the United States joined with the frequency of devastating hurricanes imperilled the lives of negroes. (1) He was extremely clear on the disadvantages the West Indies suffered from the restrictive system of commerce. And he feared much from what he considered uninformed humanitarians in England. Yet he held by the existing relationship with the mother-country. The frothy protests of planter - and - merchant meetings in London he entirely disavowed. He concludes his history with the statement - "If the colonists reflect soberly, I am persuaded they will perceive that, in a contest with the mother-country, they have nothing to gain and everything to lose". (2)

Associated with the agitation for the abolition of the slave-trade is the founding of Sierra Leone. The blacks, whom the exertions of Granville Sharp and the 1772 judgment of Lord Mansfield had freed, tended to collect in London. Humanity debated how best they might be succoured. In 1787, philanthropists chartered the "Nautilus", Captain Thomson, and had them conveyed

(1) See above page 112, note (1). Merivale, "Lectures of Colonization and Colonies", 1842, p.80, cites this to show that hard-heartedness was not confined to "political economists and advocates of free trade".

(2) Edwards, op.cit., II, p.478.

(1)
to the peninsula of Sierra Leone. A grant of land for the purposes of the proposed settlement was duly attested by the mark of King Tom. Opinion certainly called this new colony into being; it is altogether and completely to be attributed to the humane tendencies of the decade.
(2)

Evil days ensued. The Slave trade again claimed some of the repatriated as its victims.
(3)
To strengthen the settlement the Sierra Leone Company was founded. With some hope of profit but more concern for the civilisation of Africa, abolitionists advanced the capital. The concurrence of the House of Commons was won by 87 to 9. Among the minority was Lord Sheffield. In a dozen lines, as his speech is reported, he expresses an attitude to colonies which has already been alluded to as occasioning the historian of the West Indies grave concern.
(4)

(1) Cf. Mr. Cawthorne on the Sierra Leone Settlement Bill, May 30, 1791. "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, 651.

(2) The credit for the original idea is variously assigned. Clarkson, op.cit., I, p.231, refers to "the Black poor, whom Mr. Sharp was sending under the auspices of Government to Sierra Leone." The latter according to an adverse critic of the scheme in the House of Commons framed a code of laws for the settlement. Parl. Hist., XXIX, 651. G.W.Meadley in his "Memoirs of William Paley D.D.", 1809, says, p.104, that Pitt and Paley hit on the idea simultaneously. Ramsay Muir, "A Short History of the British Commonwealth", II, p.139 assigns the credit of Freetown purchase scheme to Henry Smeatham. The Scots Magazine, 53, pp.579-580; 643-644, attributes the project to Jonas Hanway.

(3) See excerpt from letter from A.Falconbridge, April 18, 1791, (Pitt MSS. 310) Cf. "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, 651-653; Clarkson, op.cit., II, pp.383 - 387.

(4) See above p. 116 and note (1).

The noble lord objected to the Sierra Leone Settlement bill on principle, "as its object was to found a colony. We had colonies enough: and this would be a source of expense, would prove the destruction of our people and might be the means of provoking quarrels with other powers."⁽¹⁾ This is a surprisingly clear-cut statement of an attitude common enough in the next generation.

The new company had colonists in view. John Clarkson R.N., the brother of the abolitionist, was sent to Nova Scotia to bring back the loyalist blacks who had found the climate trying. He embarked some eleven hundred persons in fifteen ships, and landed them successfully at Freetown in March 1792.⁽²⁾ Rain, sickness, lack of immediately fruitful employment were early difficulties. Tillage areas were distributed by lot. Some of the best fell to the lazy. The company, though authorised to do so, hesitated to apply the corrective of confiscation. The temper of the Nova Scotians proved uncertain. The natives were hostile. The slave trade fomented their grievances against the whites and their protégés. The first governor, Zachary Macaulay, found the traffic in slaves the greatest obstacle to the colony's progress. Soon, in a small way, both the educational and commercial undertakings of the company flourished. Disaster in the shape of a French fleet was on the horizon. Twenty-one months after the outbreak of war

(1) "Parl. Hist.", XXIX, 651.

(2) Clarkson, op.cit., II, pp. 342 - 345. An official history to be found in Appendix I of a report on the Sierra Leone Company presented by Viscount Castlereagh, May 25, 1802, gives the number landed as 1,200, and the capital of the company as £230,000. "Reports from the Committees of the House of Commons", 1715-1801, X, pp.735 ff.

the buildings of the company were burned. The loss, estimated at £52,000, was a severe blow to the prospects of this largely humanitarian establishment.⁽¹⁾

Public opinion as humanitarian concerned itself chiefly during the decade with the agitation for the abolition of the slave trade. Slaves might be said to occupy the middle distance in the picture presented to the philanthropic eye. In the immediate foreground, with forms blurred with very proximity, were fellow-Englishmen whose misdeeds had involved, perhaps merited, the sentence of exile. In the farther distance were the coloured races for whose protection and civilisation the empire had obligations. As an object on the sky-line, afterwards neglected for things nearer at hand, may yet strike the eye first when a new view is presented to it, so these aborigines and their needs had made the first impression on the retina of the nation's philanthropy. The recognition of imperial trusteeship antedates the so-called awakening of the national conscience in the second last decade of the century.

In fact, it had always been tacitly recognised that the civilisation of the natives was an end in colonisation.⁽¹⁾ Even Spain had had her La Casas. The Society for Propagating the

(1) Sierra Leone Report, op.cit., pp. 736, 737.

(2) Bannister, "Humane Policy," 1830, pp. 6, 14, 15. Of Mr. S. Bannister, late Attorney-General in New South Wales, Professor Herman Merivale says his "extensive acquaintance with the subject entitles all his opinions to attention". "Lectures", op.cit., II pp. 158, 159. Consistently the economist treats his views with deference.

Gospel in New England was founded before the middle of the seventeenth century. ⁽¹⁾ Fifty years later the more familiar organisation distinguished by the indication of its field as "in Foreign Parts" began its work. The efforts of this most important of early missionary societies gradually became less efficient. In the years immediately preceding the war with the American colonies it declined into "a mere official corps". ⁽²⁾ Colonial missionaries were opposed lest their success should mean the attachment of christianised Indians to the colonial administrations.

A definite pronouncement on the governmental policy towards the Indians is made in the proclamations of October 7, 1763. Two printed pages out of five are devoted to them. "Whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies;" is the preamble to the prohibition of purchases from the Indians "without our especial leave and Licence". Even to trade with them a license must be obtained. The reservation of all "Lands beyond the Heads or Sources of any of the Rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from the West and North West" for their exclusive use might seem to suggest a political purpose in such magnanimity. Bannister's opinion is

(1) 1649, (70, Fenchurch Street,) See Appendix II, p. 411, for later societies.

(2) Bannister, "British Colonisation", pp. 154, 155.

that such official action was in line with the philanthropic views becoming general at the time, and that "an extensive improvement in our colonial relations with coloured tribes, would probably have taken place early in this century (the nineteenth) , if the triumph of bureaucracy had not prevented the natural effects of public opinion upon public measures".⁽¹⁾

The proclamation cited was followed up in somewhat perfunctory fashion. Article 32 of the Instructions to Governor Carleton⁽²⁾ is identical with it in general policy. It is amplified by referring to "a Plan proposed by our Commissioners for Trade and Plantations in 1764". This lengthy document is instinct with Colbertism. Clause 8 gets away from the peltry trade only so far as to recommend to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts the appointment of four missionaries in each Indian district.⁽³⁾ Rum was not to be sold to them, nor credit given beyond the sum of fifty shillings. Most of its regulations, certainly the two last, must have remained dead letters. Sir John Johnson and the loyalists included "those nations of Indians who took part in the Support of the Royal Cause" in their petition of April 1785.⁽⁴⁾ Joseph Brant, the famous son of a more famous Mohawk chief, visited the Home Secretary in London in 1786 to obtain

(1) "British Colonization", p.161.

(2) Sess. Paper, op.cit., p.607.

(3) Ibid. p. 614.

(4) Ibid. p. 775.

compensation for losses suffered by his people in the late war.
 His suit was granted to a considerable extent, ⁽¹⁾ but in all probability as a politic rather than as a distinctively humanitarian measure.

But although the Home Secretary might write the Lieutenant-Governor that "the affairs of the Indians have lately been a subject of much consideration", ⁽²⁾ it is to be doubted whether the attitude of the ministry partook to any degree of that warmth of feeling which had characterised Dr. Johnson's outline of the duties of the civilised to uncivilised peoples, ⁽³⁾ or even of the glow which imparted such exceptional eloquence to the speech of the prime minister a few years afterwards, when he compared the dawn of civilisation in Africa to the rays of the morning sun then beginning to stream through the windows of St. Stephens. ⁽⁴⁾ The slave trade focussed the attention of the philanthropists and through them that of the public and the administration. It was well that it was so. Dissipated by several objects the force which eventually proved effective to one purpose had perhaps failed of all. What had happened had Southern Africa fallen into

(1) Ibid. pp. 306, 309, probably to redress the balance in favour of the British allegiance disturbed by Lafayette's recent visit to the Six Nations. Cf. *ibid.* p. 779, and to guard against further alienation which might result from the meeting of Indian deputies with Congressional representatives which was then pending.

(2) Sydney to Hope, April 6, 1786. Ibid. pp. 305, - 303

(3) Preface to the "World Displayed", ^{"Works,"} 12 vols., 1792, II, p. 208.f.

(4) April 2/3 1792, Parl. Hist., XXIX, 1134 - 1158.

(1)
our hands while the slave trade was still a legal traffic is difficult to imagine. Recognition of the rights of the coloured races came slowly enough even after the exploitation of them as merchandise was banned.

(2)
Yet some attention was given to the thought of aborigines other than enslaved negroes during the decade, attention which, if it is not significant in its immediate influence on policy, at least formed the basis of what was to be effective opinion in the succeeding generation. Cook's voyages had brought the South Sea Islander home to British imaginations. The realistic pages of his journal constituted a valuable corrective to the views Rousseau had made current regarding the blissful state of nature.

Bannister notes that Ferguson's "History of Civil Society" reached a sixth edition in 1793. It is described as depicting the "steady though slow progress towards civilisation" of the island aborigine "in the most attractive manner ever penned," (3) Not only did the British public read of the needs of the coloured races of the Pacific at the moment when compassion towards backward races most easily moved them, but in the person of Cook's Omai

(1) The first British order-in-council abolishing a part of the slave trade was that of Sept. 13, 1805, directed against the traffic in recently conquered Guiana. See below page 181.

(2) Gentleman's Magazine, 58, pt. II, 813. The reviewer regrets America's attitude to the savage though "she joins with Britain" regarding the slave.

(3) "British Colonization", p.162.

(4) See "Penny Magazine", 1832, p.69, for a cut of the portrait of this Friendly Islander by Reynolds, a poetic apostrophe by Cowper, and a biographical note.

they actually saw a representative of the Otaheitians. Individual fellow-men of dusker hue were introduced to them in person or in travels in increasing numbers, some of them men of exceptional development; ⁽¹⁾ all of whom, the abler perhaps more than the sub-normal, enforced the argument for missionary enterprise.

Nor was it Christianity alone that inferior subject peoples needed. Simple justice the age increasingly assured them. In this connection the spectacular impeachment of a successful governor, returned from conquests which in Rome had meant a triumphal procession, enforced a needed lesson. Despite the party aspects of the case it was a tribute to the new-felt demands of humanity. It was not alone as an attack on a would-be Verres. Before another decade was out a governor of Trinidad was to be prosecuted criminally for high-handed administration, and a military governor of Goree executed for murder.

The influence of British opinion on colonial policy during the years between the American and the Revolutionary wars was active and positive. Its organisation puts it in a class by itself. Its failure to secure the desired abolition does not derogate from the value of the agitation as an illustration of the efficacy of mass purpose. The fears associated with the spread of republican principles were insurmountable. The Privy Council inquiry which

(1) Such as Bennelong or Banalong whom Captain Phillips brought back with him in 1793 from New South Wales, and who for two years was fêted and lionised in all aristocratic quarters. Cf. Bonwick, "The First Twenty Years in Australia", p.179; Cf. Merivale, op.cit., II, p.202; Bannister, "British Colonization" pp.129, 162 and note.

the ministry volunteered, and the founding of Sierra Leone, are earnest of what had been quickly accomplished had the times been normal. Regarding the selection of New South Wales as a penal settlement, opinion constituted a negative control; Africa was too deadly. The quickened human sympathies of the decade made the nation peculiarly susceptible to what information was forthcoming regarding the colonists and ^{their} aboriginal neighbours. The basis of the missionary enterprise of the succeeding years was broadly laid. The information which had been so conspicuously lacking before 1783 began to be supplied in a new and official fashion, by the reports of committees appointed to investigate special problems. In this way the West Indies came to be better known, ⁽¹⁾ an incidental result, and a not unimportant one of the humanitarian movement in English thought. The philanthropists had not reached their objectives; their efforts are carried on into the war years.

The decade which has been dealt with to this point promised more liberality in colonial policy than it realised. Opinion had not yet been schooled to an all-round constructive attitude such as it had manifested on a single point. The years saw the principles of free, reciprocal relations between mother country and the colonies "like a wasted purpose melt in air". Shelburne's economic proposals as well as Pitt's parliamentary reforms stand out as "splendid failures" because the people withheld their support. Save for the great wave of sympathy which swept the

(1) Edwards, op.cit.,

country — sympathy strangely enough for the unfortunate abroad rather than at home — the preoccupation of the age was industrial and commercial. The colonies offered the entrepreneur no field of employment with half the promise of the manufacturing towns and the crowded ports of the home-land. Where exceptions to the rule occurred, mercantile enterprise lent a quick ear. Two such occur, Penang and Nootka Sound. The former, rechristened Prince of Wales Island, was occupied "in the name of His Majesty George III, and for the use of the Honourable East India Company" on August 11, 1786. ⁽¹⁾ The latter had been pre-empted in 1778 by London merchants. The seizure of their ships by Spain in 1789 ⁽²⁾ resulted in energetic preparations on the part of Pitt and the nation to enforce British rights. Spain acquiesced. George Vancouver took possession of the territory again in 1792. In the ⁽³⁾ case both of Penang and Nootka private initiative led the way. In this respect the second empire followed in the footsteps of the first. A more spectacular feature in the analogy was about to be thrown on the screen — another war with France, resulting in further bequests to the British Empire almost as great as those assigned by the Peace of Paris.

(1) Steuart, "The Founders of Penang and Adelaide", The expedition was led by Captain Francis Light. He had negotiated the cession of the island by the young Malay Raja of Keddah. His commission was from Sir John Macpherson, the Governor of Bengal. See pp. 9, 10, 22.

(2) Gents. Mag. 60, pt. I, 470, notes, that anomaly in British justice, "a hot press" of seamen in the Thames as explained by the King's message to the House of Commons regarding Nootka Sound.

(3) Was it doubt regarding the success of a penal colony established by government — though they themselves advocated such action — which prompted the report of July 28, 1785 of the committee on convicts to add "All great discoveries and commercial establishments originate in individual enterprise"?

C H A P T E R V.

THE WAR YEARS: 1793 - 1815.

"The true state of every nation is the state of common life."
- Dr. Johnson.

"The particulars, therefore, which Lord Selkirk has related in the history of the Highlands, may be regarded as the description of a general change; for which, in all such countries, legislators ought to be prepared, that they may not, like our English statesmen of old, even Sir Thomas More and Lord Bacon, mistake, as symptoms of decay and devastation, the movements actually occasioned by the growth of wealth, enterprize, and industry."
-Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1805.

The normal problems of colonial policy were dwarfed by the issues of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. Of simple necessity statesmen adopted a natural attitude of laissez-faire towards them, or relegated their supervisory duties to subordinates. The legislature lacked time to enquire which course they had adopted. Opinion, also, had other things to concern itself with, to give expression to, when means of expression were allowed it. For the first regrettable consequence of the reaction of the French Revolution on Britain, from the point of view of this study, was the astonishingly severe and effective trammels to which British opinion was subjected.

The first thirty-three years of the reign of George III had witnessed great strides in the growth of a creditable newspaper press. Not only were there more papers: there were better papers.

Trained writers had adopted the profession of journalist. In Gillray a caricaturist had been found whose pencil furnished a most effective means of criticising party and ministerial action. The right to report debates had been wrested. At the crucial moment Fox's Libel Act clarified a doubtful situation at law, and proved, at once, a most opportune backing to honest critics of policy.

In this very year the fears of government, that without repressive measures the constitution was in danger of being overturned, gave rise to disturbing proclamations. The sorry details of the suppression of English liberties cannot be given here. The world has too recently witnessed the necessity, which war brings in its train, of limiting individual freedom, to tempt one to sweeping castigation of the extreme enactments of the champions of Church and State in the later eighteenth century. Moderation was lacking on both sides. Opposed to an extravagant democracy, which spoke much more than it meant, because it was just learning to speak, was a jealous loyalism⁽¹⁾ which disregarded the legitimate own grievances of the discontented. Though by their^{own} showing nine-tenths of the people were absolutely sound, ministerialists were stampeded by dagger scenes and old wives' tales into transporting⁽²⁾ tactless reformers and imprisoning drunken yeomen. The super-

(1) May, "The Constitutional History of England", (ed. Holland) 1912, II, p.32. Cf. for unfortunate effects of voluntary societies for repressing sedition. See Gents. Mag., 1793, vol. 63, p.48 for list of Corporate Bodies pledged to such assistance in London.

(2) Cf. May, op.cit., p.36 note, for sentence of a year's imprisonment meted out to one such by Kent Quarter Sessions, the penalty being endorsed by Lord Chancellor Loughborough.

heated imaginations of the alarmists involved the government in humiliating defeats in the law courts. It is to be questioned whether the deterrent effect of state trials was not more than counter-balanced by the encouragement given to self-deluded agitators by the acquittal of Horne Tooke; whether the Corresponding Societies were not less dangerous in the open, reprobating taxation, demanding peace and parliamentary reform, than they were when driven underground to spread more doubtful doctrines; whether the views of Lord Braxfield and Dr. Horsley were not quite as reprehensible as those of the Reverend Gilbert Wakefield and William Cobbett. Political discussion was banned. Public meetings were to be held at a magistrate's whim and broken up at his nod. Reading-rooms required a license. The newspaper and advertisement stamp duties were raised, and, again, raised. ⁽¹⁾ A war against opinions in Europe became a war against opinion at home.

Agriculture flourished, supported by the Corn Law of 1791. A general enclosure bill, effected with sufficient ease in 1801, was successfully opposed during Pitt's tenure of office by lawyers and tithe-gatherers in the House of Lords. The Gilbert Acts of 1782 had abolished the work-house test. The humanity which effected this alteration failed to follow it with constructive measures. It afforded a basis for the short-sighted economy of supplementing wages from rates. Out of this grew the mammoth

(1) The Gents. Mag. Index, 1787 - 1818, III, 73, records that because of these duties the price of the magazine had to be raised in 1799 to 1/6 and in 1809 to 2/-.

burden of poor relief which penalised honest independence, turned poverty into pauperism, and put a premium on births, legitimate or illegitimate.

The policy of the ruling class succeeded for the time being in preventing the expression of opinion. The intellectual movement made progress none the less. Self-help proved widely efficacious⁽¹⁾ in all but the very lowest class. The neglect of the material condition of the people involved consequences less easily out-grown. The general policy of collecting taxes more or less uniformly doubtless enabled the nation to find the costs of war without materially handicapping industry. Yet, taking the long view, it unduly eased the burden on the classes better able to pay. The industrialists extended their enterprises: the landed pulled down their barns to build greater. An aggravated social problem resulted, in the widening chasm between rich and poor. After the war the suffering of the masses was to give the colonies a new significance, promising the industrious poor, in emigration, a hope of escape from their burdens.

Meanwhile speculative views which were to exert great influence on colonial policy found time to work and spread. Adam Smith's freer trade arguments had been given concrete embodiment in the reciprocal treaty with France. England's advantages therein were speedily manifest. Bad harvests, and consequent short commons, powerfully enforced the plea for a less jealous attitude to the

(1) "There is probably no period in English history at which a greater number of poor men have risen to distinction". Leslie Stephen, "English Utilitarians", I, pp. 111, 112. Cf. Burns, Paine, Cobbett, Eldon, Dalton, Porson, White, Owen, Lancaster, Place. Dicey, "Law and Opinion in England", pp. 113, 114.

(1) importation of corn. 1791 was the last year in which any considerable quantity had been available for export. In 1794 a treaty of amity was concluded with America whereby she received concessions in English ports. (2) Her raw cotton was greatly coveted on the one side; on the other the increasing difficulties under which she traded with France helped to overcome her disinclination to closer commercial affiliation with England. In the assessed taxes of 1797, the tentative application of demanding national revenue (3) where the capacity to provide it was greatest, was another sign of the blossoming of Smith's ideas in practice. (4) The protest of the peers against the corn law of 1815 is based on a clear appreciation of the cogency of the free trade arguments. Two years earlier Dugald Stewart testified that this economic doctrine "has now, I believe, become the prevailing creed of thinking men all over Europe." (5)

(1) Table of food stuffs exported to Great Britain from Canada,

	1796	1799	1802	1807	1808
Wheat - bushels	3,106	128,870	1,010,033	234,543	186,708.
Flour - barrels	4,352	14,425	28,301	20,424	42,462.
Biscuit - cwt.	3,882	20,535	22,051	28,047	32,537.

Lambert's "Travels through Canada", I, p.229.

(2) The Grenville - Jay treaty of Nov. 19, was not ratified in the United States till April 30, 1796, nor in Britain till 1797. The chief concession was that American produce was to be admitted in American ships. Leone Levi, "History of British Commerce", 1872, pp. 83, 159.

(3) It is interesting to note that the first of three radical objections to the proposed 10% tax on income was that such an "odious and vexatious" "compulsary disclosure of property" would encourage the emigration of the industrial classes of the community. See Sir J. Sinclair's speech of Dec. 14, 1798, given in full in "History of the Public Revenue", (1803), ii, p.240.

(4) Smith's influence on direct taxation is described as small by Kennedy, "English Taxation 1640 - 1799", p.141.

(5) "Philosophy of the Human Mind", II, p.472.

Similarly in regard to industry the policy of non-interference on the part of government, which Adam Smith did so much to popularise, was being widely accepted. ^cPractical demonstrations of individual success, unassisted by anything approaching paternalism, demanded and justified such a policy. And what this age of industry insisted upon fitted well into the inherited thought of Englishmen. The disciples of Bentham were, in due course, to give it a fuller economic and philosophic basis. As early as 1806, a committee of the House of Commons regarded the right of capitalistic enterprise as a constitution-conferred birth-right of the Briton. As early as this is found the distortion of the so-called laws of political economy which was to make truth itself the fool of fiends.

The great influence of the "Wealth of Nations" has been assigned in part to that inherent dualism which made it appeal to both Whigs and Tories. ⁽¹⁾In its simplest form this is found in the defence of the mercantile system from the point of view of national security, in its condemnation from that of economic expediency. This is to cite merely the most obvious instance of its agreement with the not unequivocal principles of the parties. Even during the war years it proved an arsenal of argument to both the landed interest and the industrialists; as the inter-class strife thickened, both drew munitions thence for the attack on the opposing camp. And when, and in so far as, jealousy of the growing position of the manufacturers in the state, induced the country gentlemen to co-operate with the philanthropists, ordinarily non-

(1) Cunningham, op.cit., p.591 Regarding the influence of the "Wealth of Nations", it is worth noting that the Edinburgh Review Jan.1806 mentions a recent cheap edition addressed "to artisans and tradesmen". Vol. 7, p.471.

party, this inexhaustible treatise again supplied the sinews of war to the benevolent coalition.

The strength which Adam Smith afforded to the cause of humanity was largely balanced by the injury it suffered from Malthus' essay "On Population". The main thesis of this writer was so simple as to give it cutting edge in the arguments of the time out of all proportion to its permanent value — that the perfectibility of the race was an untenable hypothesis because, whereas human beings multiplied according to a geometric ratio, food stuffs could be increased only in arithmetical progression. The 'a priori' reasoning of the edition of 1798 was given an ostensibly inductive basis in the succeeding editions. It was that the theory seemed so completely to fit the facts that gave it such currency; its support from mere reason, whether sound or questionable, was comparatively lost on the men who used it to deny virtue to philanthropic effort. While Malthus himself worked his way back to a recognition of the efficacy of moral restraint as a prudential check on a regrettable redundancy in population, succeeding theorists used the argument he had given them in its crudest form in conjunction with The Wages Fund theory to prove charity, not only useless, but nationally suicidal. What was given to a beggar not only encouraged him in the vain hope that beggars could be provided for in perpetuity, but also decreased⁽¹⁾ the fund from which honest labour was to be paid. Self-help was the only help; laissez-faire afforded all an equal chance,

(1) Malthus, "On Population", 2 vols., 1826, II, p. 66.

(1)

entrepreneur and pauper!

During these years economics was "the dismal science" indeed. The very errors of the theorists helped to bring about the same practical end as the truth in their precepts; and both contributed (2) to free the capitalist alike in agriculture and in industry, and to bind the labourer and the operative. In addition the mistaken humanity which instituted the Speenhamland system of doles provided both farmers and manufacturers with cheaper labour; and the anti-Jacobinism of the politically influential classes combined with the false economy in which members of parliament sincerely believed, to enact the Combination Acts and prevent the unfortunates, against whom the balance, in theory and in practice, was so woefully set, from getting an approximation to justice by their own unaided efforts. The false assumption which resulted in such a disastrous conclusion was that inherited from Locke that eighteenth century England was a society of freeholders. Had it been, laissez-faire as the policy of the state had been true liberty. As it was, by the seemingly ubiquitous irony of fate, the supporters of the 'status quo' during the troubled years of the French Revolution endorsed as irrefragible in economics, what they reprobated in holy horror in politics, license rather than liberty.

(1) Positive assistance to the labourer was afforded by laissez-faire. 33 Geo.III, c.54 began the removal of the restriction which tied the worker to his parish, as also 5 Geo.IV, c.97 which removed the ban on the emigration of skilled artisans.

(2) Cannan, "Theories of Production and Distribution", 2nd. Ed., 1903, p. 391.

When the Revolutionary War, which never quite freed itself from the stigma attaching to aggression, became the Napoleonic War the more liberal elements in Britain found themselves in thorough harmony with the national effort. The questions raised by the opposition were now those of means. The change is marked by a more liberal policy in home affairs. The first Factory Act had already sprung from a Tory manufacturer's fellow-feeling for his employees. A general measure of elementary education was proposed: though it failed, its having been entertained marks an epoch. Reformers might now question the "matchless constitution" without immediately being classed as Jacobins.

The abolition of the slave trade has already been referred to as the classical example of the influence of opinion on policy. The war years were to see its actual accomplishment. Fox's championship of the cause had been so whole-heartedly sympathetic from the moment the subject was first broached to him, that it was fitting that the long over-due measure should be passed, if not during his life time, at least by the ministry of which he had been a member.⁽¹⁾

Whatever the final conclusion may be regarding the failure to implement the purpose of the majority of the nation during the eighteenth century, there can be no two minds regarding the perse-

(1) Clarkson, op.cit., I, p.503, II, p.568; "Wilberforce", III, p.268; Lecky, op.cit., VII, p.380.

(2) See above p. 145, note.

verance of the leaders of the popular movement. (1) "Charity", it was said, "never faileth." Both prophecies and knowledge did. The opposition interests had predicted the efficacy of turning public attention to ameliorative legislation in the islands. (2) That was too obviously a subterfuge. (3) Clarkson's health had kept him from active participation in the campaign of publicity for some eleven years. For the greater part of that time the abolition committee had not circulated books of the evils of the trade. (4) As a consequence "the youth of the rising generation knew little about the question." (5) As an illustration of the necessity of keeping public opinion informed, fully and continuously, if it is to prove an effective determinant of policy, this is not without its value. The will to end the nefarious traffic, however, had never weakened.

(1) After the rejection by the Commons in 1793 of its own resolution of the previous year, Wilberforce persisted to the end of the century in presenting and supporting motions for complete or partial abolition — for the prohibition of the supply of negroes to foreign islands, for the interdiction of the trade on a portion of the coast (that about Sierra Leone). The one success of these six years was the repeal of 5 Geo.II, c.7. Both C.R.Ellis M.P. and (Parl. Hist.XXXIII, 251-269) and Bryan Edwards had shown that this was necessary; (see above p.159) the one to permit of effective local amelioration, the other to obviate the inhumanity of separating families at bankrupt sales. During the years 1800, 1801, 1802 and 1803 Wilberforce took no action. During a considerable part of that time, the chances of an international understanding being arrived at by negotiations seemed so good that he feared to jeopardise the issue by risking a parliamentary defeat. ("Wilberforce", II, p. 26, 27.)

(2) Motion by Ellis, debate April 6, 1797, Parl.Hist.,XXXIII, 251 - 269.

(3) General Sir George Prevost, Governor of Dominica, had reported that the acts of the colonial legislatures seemed meant "as a political measure to avert the interference of the mother country in the management of slaves", a view supported by Mr. Hughan M.P. Parl. Debates, VIII, 1042.

(4) Clarkson, op.cit., II, pp.471, 502; "Wilberforce", op.cit. III, pp.162, 271.

(5) Clarkson, op.cit., II, p.502.

In 1804, the committee added to its numbers a trio, each of whom has proved outstanding in later history - James Stephen, Zachary Macaulay, and Henry Brougham. In this year Wilberforce renewed the attempt to secure the passing of an abolition bill. (1) He succeeded in the Lower House: in the Lords it was postponed until the following session. By the neglect of its supporters to attend, the measure was lost in the Commons the next year. (2) In February 1806, the Ministry of All the Talents took office. The following month the Attorney-General sponsored a bill of three clauses, the first of which prohibited British merchants taking slaves into conquered colonies and islands. Fox's last contribution was the introduction, on June 10, of a motion for abolition. In spite of Castlereagh's able advocacy of progressive duties as a means of effecting gradual abolition, the resolution was adopted. The King was addressed to solicit the co-operation of foreign powers in suppressing the traffic in slaves. (3) A short enactment was also hurried through to prevent new ships fitting out for the coast during what was now seen to be the British trade's last respite. The final bill was introduced by Grenville in the House of Lords. (4) In the Commons

(1) The changed attitude of many of the planters encouraged optimism. The soil of Demerara, Bernice and Surinam was so fertile that to prevent its being planted, the islanders were attracted to the proposal of a five years suspension of the slave trade, "Wilberforce", III, pp.164, 165, 166, 212.

(2) "Wilberforce", op.cit., III, pp.212, 213. Castlereagh's becoming Secretary of State finally secured "chiefly through his habits of business" the promulgation of the long promised order-in-council against the Guiana Slave Trade, Sept.13, 1805. "Wilberforce" III, pp.184, 234. See above p.167.

(3) Motion by Wilberforce, same date. On these resolutions was based 47 Geo. III, sess.1 c.36. Parl. Debates, VII, 580-603.

(4) See next page.

Lord Howick met the demands for justice to the planters. What they called justice, he demonstrated, was favour. The order for the surrender of the seals of office all but prevented the the retiring ministry's appending the royal assent. (1)

Opinionⁱ had at last prevailed. (2) In opposition to the will of the West Indian legislatures, the English traffic in slaves had been cut off. There was naturally a tendency in the islands to compare this interference with their rights with the fatal effort of forty years before to tax the American colonies. The parallel-ism is not very close. The trade was in British hands. (3) Discussion had tended progressively to demonstrate the weakness of the position of the planters in demanding its continuance. They had recognised that there were even economic arguments in favour of abolition, in particular, from their own point of view, that the interdiction of the trade would prevent the setting up of extensive plantations in the islands which Britain had recently conquered. The interdiction of the trade would thus save them from competition within the ambit of the mercantile regulations of the Empire. A further significant distinction must be made

(4) January 2, 1807. It was Feb. 10, before it was passed, and sent on to the Commons, where it was carried by 16 votes and read a third time without a division. Parl. Debates, IX, 139. The Dukes of Clarence and Sussex had opposed it in the name of the reigning family. "Wilberforce", III, p.291; cf. p.301.

(1) March 25, "the Lord Chancellor, Lord Auckland, and Lord Holland being the royal commissioners", "Wilberforce", III, p.302; Clarkson, op.cit., II, p.572.

(2) Offences against the act were dealt with as misdemeanours until Brougham's act of 1811 made them felonies.

(3) To many of the abolitionists the just treatment of Africa was an aim that bulked larger than the termination of the horrors of the middle passage or the inhumanity indulged in in the islands. "Wilberforce", III, p.200.

between the types of colonies in question, a distinction which the logic of succeeding years has stressed. A colony, in which a white oligarchy held the every day rights of a coloured majority in its exclusive control, could not, it was coming to be recognised, demand complete autonomy on the simple ground of democratic capacity for self-government, nor yet, in a day of growing humanity, on the simple old basis of the rights of Englishmen.⁽¹⁾ Combined with this was the obvious truth that the Lesser Antilles and Jamaica were not 'home' to the English plantation-owner in the full sense in which Massachusetts stood in that relation to the patriots of '75. This was the basis of the contention of the spokesmen of the planters, when the question was one of admitting American shipping, that there was no West Indian interest to be regarded as distinct from a British interest.

In so far as this is true the whole question is a domestic rather than a colonial one. In the years following the passing of Grenville's act it entered largely into the realm of foreign politics.⁽²⁾ Opinion followed it and kept it there.⁽³⁾ It is a tribute to its strength that it moved Liverpool and Castlereagh

(1) "The fundamental idea of the older British colonial policy". Merivale, op.cit., I, p.100.

(2) "It is remarkable how large a space the abolition of the slave trade occupied in the foreign policy of Great Britain when the liberties of Europe were at stake." "The Political History of England", XI, p.151.

(3) Liverpool to Wilberforce, Sept.7, .8.4, "If I were not anxious for the Abolition of the Slave Trade on principle, I must be aware of the embarrassment to which any Government must be exposed from the present state of that question in this country."

to such diplomatic exertions to secure the concerted action of the powers of Europe in the suppression of the trade. From the nations collectively the utmost that could be obtained was its solemn denunciation as "repugnant to the principles of civilization and of universal morality". The costs of the suppression of the traffic soon fell on the British taxpayer.

The humanitarian tendencies of the British public determined policy in many minor matters also. The support which opinion gave the Sierra Leone experiment resulted in various governmental contributions to the funds of the struggling company. A committee on the petition of the Court of Directors for assistance, reported to the House that "with due encouragement ----- many of the "advantages originally proposed from the settlement, and, "in particular, the introduction of habits of industry amongst the "natives of Africa, may be realized." (1) The company proposed that Africa should receive "compensation for injuries received through the slave trade"; the nation endorsed the project; the government paid. In 1807, however, it was necessary for the crown to take (2) over the colony. It was the influence of public opinion, too, which secured the Privy Council investigation into the extreme (3) measures adopted by Governor Picton in recently-conquered Trinidad.

(1) Reports 1715 - 1803, X, p.736.

(2) 47 Geo. III, c.44.

(3) British severity held in check by a humane public was, however, so much preferable to Spanish treatment that the people of Trinidad subscribed for the Governor's defence, and petitioned to be retained by Britain.

The same pressure defeated the attempts in high quarters to secure a reprieve for the military Governor of Goree sentenced to death for inflicting 800 lashes on a sergeant with fatal consequences. (1)

The African Association, which did so much for the opening up of Africa, was supported by the same broad-based philanthropy. During these years the Association financed the epoch-making explorations of Mungo Park. Already missionary enterprise was taking devoted workers into Southern Africa, where the influence of British opinion as humanitarian was to influence colonial policy so very materially. Even into far New Zealand Christianity was to make its way during the war years. (2) The home public was keenly (3) interested in the extension of civilisation, whether it was, or was not, prepared to endorse the extension of the Empire.

(1) Encyclopedia Britannica, 1815, ad loc. "Chronology", January 28, 1802. Cf. Meadley, op.cit., p.139 for Paley's comment, also "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy", II, pp. 279, 280,

(2) Rev. Samuel Marsden from Sydney in 1814.

(3) The universality of interest during these years in native races is proved by the unexpected places in which it crops up, e.g. the first Report "on the State of the Trade of Newfoundland", March 26, 1793. Reports, 1715 - 1803, X, p.402. The Edinburgh Review for April 1808, a propos of "Travels through the Canadas" by George Heriot, deputy Postmaster General, enters a plea for more acute, less conventional works of travel, in particular for more detail regarding the Indians. Cf. vol.12, p.223. The Scots Magazine of the next year indicates the same tendency in public interest by reviewing at length Thomas Campbell's "Gertrude of Wyoming", and barely mentioning "The Mariners of England", "The Battle of the Baltic" and the other equally enduring lyrics published with this long-forgotten narrative of Indian warfare. For the poet's subsequent apology to Joseph Brant, the son of the chief whose character his verse had traduced see Bannister's "British Colonization", p. 162, note.

But the Empire was being extended. And this not only by the inevitable conquests of successful maritime warfare, but also by the daring of intrepid explorers and the administrative genius of lone Englishmen. Alexander MacKenzie's descent of the river to which he gave his name was not known in the home-land until after the declaration of war by France. While British rule was being established in Trinidad and Honduras, Bass and Flinders were completing Cook's work and naming his island continent. Five years after the Cape was seized a second time, Stamford Raffles began the economic organisation of Java. The public read, increasingly widely as the years went on, with that same British interest in the exploits of Britons in the four corners of the world, with which it had listened to the tales of Raleigh and Drake, and with which, in Burke's language, it had followed the whaling crews of New England "among the tumbling mountains of ice ----- into the deepest frozen recesses of Hudson's Bay". The growing periodical literature bears unequivocal testimony to this live appreciation on the part of the public at large. (1)

During the war years only occasional criticisms of what has since been called bureaucratic administration are met with. Yet it was during these years, and probably because they were years

(1) But compare the appreciation of British officials. The Earl of Sandwich made the MSS. of Cook's "Journals" a gratuity to a literary friend of Garrick. Lieutenant Matthew Flinders, whose rescue of his ship-wrecked crew and their safe conduct to the Mauritius in a 29 toncraft suggests the recent splendid "Trevesa" exploit, was even denied normal promotion. Sir Harry Johnson, "Pioneers in Australasia", pp. 251.

of war, that the arbitrary and inefficient government of the colonies developed to the extent which afterwards aroused such strong and effective protest.

Too much has been made of design in explaining the development of bureaucracy. (1) The policy of British statesmen has been described as a deliberate attempt, by restricting colonial rights, to avoid a second dismemberment of the empire. Not enough allowance has been made for the natural, indeed the inevitable, consequences of the circumstances. That the older colonies governed themselves without interference from the home authorities is not now accepted; (2) that happy neglect was a myth, a satisfactory piece of self-deception 'ex post facto' serving to explain, in an age that abhorred what savoured of democracy, the failure to retain America. The governments of the older colonies had been needlessly checked and restricted: the habit simply carried over into the administration of the second empire.

The outbreak of war at once increased the existing tendency to the exercise of an arbitrary executive on the part of the mother country. In particular was this true of such a war: a war against the principles of self-government. The exaggeration in this description of the Revolutionary War is admitted: but in

(1) Bannister, "British Colonization", pp. 156, 157, 158, traces its growth from the discontinuance of the practice which gave "something like an organised publicity" to the proceedings of the Board of Trade following its formation in 1697. Though it deteriorated into a mere office of registry, he maintains, with some point, that it was still a "separate" authority, and might have become a more or less effective check on the Secretary of State. Instead, it was abolished in 1782. After 1794 he holds that colonial administration became "the most official despotism ever thought of in England."

(2) Egerton, "The Causes and Character of the American Revolution", p.42. Cf. Beer, op.cit., passim, e.g. II, p.305.

the intensity of the passions engendered by anti-Jacobinism, the custodians of law and order acted as though all who spoke of rights were their natural foes. The tendency of the administrative habits of a war period to persist is notorious, and that not only in the expenditure of money. As a consequence the war years bequeathed to their successors, those no less reactionary first years of peace, a re-affirmed dictatorial policy on the part of colonial authorities in the mother country.

Not only that: the war years necessitated military governors. The rule was already established: now it was justified. The unfortunate consequence for later colonial administration did not lie, as might appear, chiefly in the arbitrary action to which military experience had accustomed Sir James Craig and Captain Phillip. That was unfortunate, but a more regrettable result was that this same army training taught what looks like the exact opposite of habitual arbitrary action, — that of referring the question to a superior and waiting for orders. The Secretary of State for War and the Colonies found no occasion to distinguish between the divisions of his department, military and civil; in both, commanding officers and subordinates deferred to the office. That the later thirties should have found the administration of the affairs of the colonies bureaucratic is not to be wondered at.

These years illustrate too the abuses of patronage. A very significant statement was made in the House of Commons some years later when a more jealous scrutiny of departmental changes, especially those relating to colonial affairs, had come into

practice. Sir C. B. Adderley (Baron Norton), in criticising the absence of the Colonial Secretary in Paris for an indefinite period, at a time when no Under-Secretary for the Colonies sat in the House, adverted to the history of the department. He said, "At the close of the last century, when Mr. Dundas was offered "the War Office, it was observed by him that he had all work and "no patronage. The Colonial Office was therefore thrown in, "where there was no work, while at the same time it was full of "patronage."⁽¹⁾ The Earl of Stair, recommending the curtailment of the country's colonial commitments, had said of what was left to Britain in North America in 1783, "New Jealousies and new Jobs will beget new Fortresses, and new Fortresses will beget new Establishments."⁽²⁾

The mal-administration of colonial affairs was seldom brought home to the British public. Bentham's criticism of the legal basis of government in the penal colony of New South Wales was written in 1805. It shows that, though the legislature had empowered His Majesty "to establish a court of criminal judicature" no sanction whatever of the superior right of legislation had been given. His strictures on the carelessness of the law officers of the crown partake too much of the nature of what he calls "dry law" to have given them, despite a popular title, "A Plea for the Constitution", much vogue. The fact is that this damaging

(1) March 12, 1855, Hansard, 3rd. Series, CXXXVII, 427.

(2) "An Address to, and Expostulation with the Public", 1784, p. 30.

(1)

indictment was not published until 1830.

Some criticism there was. Nepotism and absenteeism were weaknesses in the system of colonial government long known and strongly reprobated. But even these faults needed to be seen in the colonies to be forcefully presented to the public at home. Bryan Edwards had refrained from telling the worst he knew. Yet he wrote that it was the "melancholy truth" that party was a title to office, and that "ignorance and profligacy" were not necessarily disqualifications. (2) In many cases the duties of office were performed by a deputy's deputy, and the subordinate was as likely to be unknown to the principal, as a cotter in an Irish hovel was to an absentee landlord. And this in spite of 22 Geo. III c.75 which required the residence of appointees.

Suggestive criticism of details of misgovernment was presented by occasional travellers. Among others might be cited Lambert's treatment of the importance to the Canadas of the actual presence of their Governors. He pictures the actual residence of the functionary as stimulating the whole communal life of the colony, not alone socially but commercially. The disbursement of his suite, and the pay of the greater body of troops his presence involved, infused a brisker spirit into business. He maintains that the Governor's residence made for better administration of the law. "But when the principal is absent, and, as it has frequently happened, his deputy also, the

(1) "Works", ed. Bowring, 1843, IV, p.249 - 284.

(2) Edwards, op.cit., II, pp. 320 -324.

"other members of the government never like to take any responsibility upon themselves. They would rather, I believe, that the most beneficial plans should miscarry, or even an enemy be allowed to ravage the country, than that they should attempt (1)
 "to act without positive instructions from home."

This indicates not only how prone governors were to ask for leave of absence from their duties, and how their absence contributed to increase the direction of local affairs by the Colonial Office, but also how comparatively trifling was the sum total of colonial activity in these early years. In this is found some excuse for the ignorance which still prevailed in the mother-land regarding the colonies. While the latter made slow material progress the British public heard very little of them. Regarding the West Indies a wider knowledge obtained. As a theatre of war, it became too well known. One hundred thousand casualties was an association with the islands altogether indelible. Of the penal colony experiment occasional news items came through such as the (2)
 discovery of Macquarrie Island and its sealing possibilities.

Canada was very little known until it, too, assumed a new importance as a battle-field. (3) Then, it is true, it was given a place

(1) Lambert's "Travels in America", 3 vols., 1810, as reviewed in the Scots Magazine, 73, p.193. Sir James Craig's arrival is mentioned as bringing in its train all the beneficial results indicated. This well-informed, frank and unbiassed author reprinted his diverting work in two volumes in 1814. Cf. I, pp.231, 232.

(2) Scots Magazine, 1812, vol.74, p.867; or the first shipment of wool in 1807.

(3) Volume after volume of the Scots Magazine, for example, during the years prior to 1812 can be turned through without finding a reference to Canada. When travels are reviewed the features stressed for the British public are chapters of Indian life. E.g. Long's "Travels in America", Scots Mag.1792, vol.54, p.186.

in the journals of the day. And while the war of 1812 - 14 acted as a sedative in local politics in Lower Canada, it also contributed to bring both provinces prominently before the mind of the people in Britain. The petitions later to be received by government for assistance to emigrate to Canada reveal what is better known in the Dominion today — how effective a war is as an advertising agency, and its aftermath as an incentive to emigrate.

Generally Britain's knowledge of the North American colonies was but very slightly increased during two decades of war. When these provinces were thought of it was ordinarily in the vague or inaccurate terms which Johnson had used, or even Goldsmith's Chinese philosopher. (1) Men of letters were little more up-to-date in their acquaintance with colonial affairs. Sydney Smith, for example, writes of such matters with the most superficial knowledge. (2)

The direct expenses of the up-keep of civil and military authority in the colonies as a whole were borne in on public opinion during the war years. To this end Sir John Sinclair had contributed largely. (3) Under eleven specific heads he details "the

(1) Goldsmith, "Works", ed. Prior, 4 vols., 1837, vol. II p. 62. In this letter "A Citizen of the World" describes Canada as "a country cold, desolate and hideous." There the savages "knew no enemies but the prowling bear or insidious tiger (sic)" "---large colonies were sent abroad to procure furs."

(2) Edinburgh Review, April, 1803, vol. 2, pp. 30-42. "An account of the English Colony of New South Wales", being a review of the popular two volume history of Lieutenant-Colonel Collins.

(3) He acknowledges Sir John Dalrymple, fourth Earl of Stair's having advanced the argument as early as 1776. In "An Address etc. ---", op.cit., p. 30, the latter had maintained that "nothing can relieve the country to any useful Extent and Purpose, but the parting of some of our foreign possessions which cost the most to the public, & bring the smallest returns of profit or of national consequence." In this category he placed Canada first, Gibraltar second.

"whole expenses we have been put to in consequence of our possess-
 "ing colonies on the continent of North America." The grand total
 is £40,533,166. To this he would add the greater part of "the
 "charges of at least two wars, which cost us above 240 millions
 "more, and which were entered into principally on their account." (1)

He showed not only that the annual bill for the prestige of
 empire was excessive, but that it was disquietingly uncertain.
 Naval, military and ordinance charges in the colonies were
 involved in the accounts of other services: in particular, this
 doubt, which was worse than knowledge, was attributable to "the
 "indistinctness with which the extraordinaries of the army were
 "laid before parliament." (2)

This calculation did not include expenses incurred in the
 West Indies, nor in the African forts and the civil establishment
 in Senegambia, nor in the recently established penal colony. The
 worthy baronet finds it the more necessary "to bring forward
 "inquiries into this branch of our expenditure, as the rage for
 "colonization has not yet been driven from the Councils of our
 "country. We have fortunately lost New England; but a New Wales
 "has started up." (3) What it is to cost the country he hesitates
 to predict. He has previously stated that "the system of

(1) "History of the Public Revenue", pt.III, (1790) pp.86, 87;
 Pt.II, (1785) had indicated the large part the colonies had played
 in adding to the national debt, as repeated in the 3rd. edition,
 (1803) I, p.402.

note (2)
 (2) Ibid. p.86. See below p. 350 re Sir Henry Parnell's
 findings 1828.

(3) Sinclair, op.cit., pt.III, p.87 concedes that the West
 Indies as compared with the colonies cost in times of peace very
 little.

(4) Ibid. p.89.

political conduct" which has obtained since the Revolution of 1688 has kept two objects in view, "to check the power of the House of Bourbon", and "to acquire, to establish or to preserve colonial settlements for the purposes of commerce." He now asks which object can best be given up in view of the heavy costs which seeking both has entailed. It is easily demonstrated that "a safe and intimate connection with France" would be secured with difficulty and depended on with danger. "A general colonial emancipation" might much more easily be secured by the concerted action of the nations of Europe. Naturally the chapter closes (1) with a peroration on the glowing prospects of universal free trade.

Bentham's address to the National Convention, "shewing the "uselessness and mischievousness of distant dependencies to a "European State" followed three years after Sinclair's "History of the Public Revenue". Its advice was what Dean Tucker had (2) offered Necker ten years before — "Emancipate your colonies." (3) The gist of argument is that not colonies but capital fosters trade. Bentham puts it epigrammatically, (4) but Sinclair had the

(1) And this without thought of the inconsistency between such a rhapsody and the advocacy of increased bounties referred to above, p.105, note (3); Cf. Sinclair, op.cit., (1785) pt.II, p.124.

(2) See above p.32.

(3) "Works", IV, pp.408-418, entrusted to Talleyrand's secretary in 1793; circulated in MSS.; published 1830. There is an interesting parallelism between Sinclair's long paragraph setting forth the reasonableness of asking France to join in a general emancipation of colonies and Bentham's argument that it was expedient to do so. Cf. Sinclair, pt.III, p.103.

(4) Ibid. p.411, "Trade is the child of Capital."

idea clearly when he wrote, "Some provinces in North America, "some colonies in the West Indies, some settlements of the coast "of Africa ----- can never compensate for the waste of treasure "and blood!"

The burden of debt, war taxation none too perfectly assessed, combining with the hardships inevitably associated with the industrial and the agricultural revolutions, enforced the lessons from Sinclair and Bentham. There were others, too, to point the moral. Writing on the new colony in Australia in 1803, Sydney Smith is flatly sceptical of any such prospects for the colony as the writer, whose article he is reviewing, had envisaged. That he based his vision on his knowledge made no difference. What, asks the untravelled one, when the colony matures? "Are we to spend "another hundred millions in discovering its strength, and to "humble ourselves again before a fresh set of Washingtons and "Franklins?"

The war years saw the estimation of colonies sink appreciably in Britain. The cost of defending the most prized of them, the West Indies, had been immense; the toll in lives astounding. What assistance the islands could render the mother-country in return had been small; that from the other colonies almost
(1)
negligible. The idea was disseminated that, divested of colonies, the defence of Great Britain and Ireland in time of war would be possible at a relatively trifling cost. The retention of colonies on the other hand constituted just so many potential causes of war.

(1) See Canadian food shipments, above p.175, note (1)

The seeming inevitability of colonies separating, or being separated, from the mother country grew during these years. (1)
 The British navy had gathered in so easily the colonies of Britain's foes. More telling than such an object lesson, for a people so confident in the powers of its senior service as the British people, perhaps so unimaginative as well, were the obvious tendencies in South America. Independence was the aim of Spain's continental colonies. Three of them had already taken advantage of the mother-country's distress to declare for themselves. The loss of the English colonies in America had been something quite unparalleled in history. What was coming in the southern half of the New World went to show that that loss was in the nature of things, something normal, likely to occur again. Britons who might have been tempted to attribute to ministerial mismanagement the necessity of acknowledging the independence of the United States, were compelled to ask if there was not some essential weakness about the connection with colonies when they saw history repeating itself on such a spectacular scale so soon.

(1) The thought of Europe seems consistently to have been that they could not be retained permanently. It is possible that this is one reason why the higher classes in Britain were more sceptical concerning the permanence of empire than the people generally. Cf. Talleyrand, "Essai sur les avantages a retirer de Colonies Nouvelles dans les Circonstances présentes", generously excerpted in *Edinburgh Review*, April 1805, vol.6, pp.63 - 79. The reviewer takes a middle view. He denies that trade with America is greater than it would have been had there been no separation. He agrees that "cheap goods" constitute a stronger bond than "sentiment". He refuses, however, to concede that "profit on stock is all a great nation has to think of in the management of its affairs". (p.77)

All these insidious doubts the economists of the day called to their assistance in urging a thorough-going break with the old colonial system. They appealed to the increased trade with independent United States to prove that no commercial loss would follow the freeing of the colonials: that the expense of their upkeep would be so much clear gain. The chief argument for the retention of a colonial empire was that it was a guarantee of an efficient navy and an adequate supply of seamen. Colonies had so long been associated with ships and commerce that the argument that capital commanded the world's markets was accepted with reservations. The vogue of the classical economists was great: in that age of industrial expansion they were heard as perhaps never before or since. Yet though their argument was sound it was abstract. On the basis that colonial settlements were "for the purposes of commerce", the conclusion that the system was unprofitable and should be abandoned was incontestable. The colonial monopoly, many admitted, was "a compact between the government and its colonies, of which the mother country is the sacrifice and dupe."

But was commercial advantage the one end of empire? Even if national security could be placed beyond question, was there not something other that made overseas possessions well worth while? Sceptics, with some truth, had answered that patronage was an end, that places for younger sons and discredited partisans made colonies worth while to the governing class. Here the

touchstone of the greatest good to the greatest number gave an infallible answer — emancipate them. There had, a few short years before, been many to agree with Lord Sheffield that the one use and advantage of colonies was "the monopoly of their consumption and the carriage of their produce."⁽¹⁾ There were now many to agree with Bentham and the economists that they were an outgrown shell to be sloughed off by the chambered nautilus of the expanding Free Trade state.

The subject is clouded in obscurity and contradiction. After 1815 more voices are raised on both sides of the question; even then the great middle class remains largely inarticulate. Up to this date, the Edinburgh Review leans to the policy of cutting colonial commitments. Sydney Smith's definite doubt regarding the possibility of retaining full-grown colonies constitutes, however, the limit of the journal's pessimism.⁽²⁾ In protesting against the demands which England quite unjustifiably made of the United States at the pourparlers at Ghent, the Edinburgh Review describes the colony, whose security was made the pretext for such aggressive insistence, as "the insignificant province"⁽³⁾

(1) "Observations on the Commerce of the United States". p.138.

(2) Edinburgh Review, April 1803, vol.2, pp.30 - 42. See above, pp. 192, 195.

(3) Full military control on the Great Lakes, guaranteed neutrality of the territory at the time occupied by Indian tribes, British allies; and absolute cession of a portion of north-eastern United States to facilitate communication between New Brunswick and the St. Lawrence.

of Canada." (1) Some allowance must be made here for righteous indignation against war-mongers, but the unfairness with which, in the face of the facts clearly demonstrated at that date, the loyalty of Canadians, especially of French-Canadians, is referred to, is hard to palliate. (2) Regarding the emigration of the Highlanders to British North America rather than to the United States the journal is more imperialistic. It has the strongest commendation for Lord Selkirk's Prince Edward Island colony. A barrier of loyal Britons across the southern frontier of the Canadas it describes as the wisest and simplest of defensive measures. The government should intervene to facilitate such settlement. (3) This is a somewhat striking recommendation for such a periodical in such a day. Not that it finds emigration in itself advantageous: it regards it under the circumstances as inevitable. The islesmen are going: they should remain British: they can be encouraged to do so. Those who, as Johnson put it, "are already fluttering on the wing" (4) might be offered such facilities in British colonies as to attract them thither, without

(1) Edinburgh Review, Nov. 1814, 24, pp. 258, 259.

(2) Ibid., p.260.

(3) "But measures on so extensive a scale as may be required can only be accomplished by those to whom the interests of the nation are particularly entrusted". Edinburgh Review, October 1815, vol. 7, p.201.

(4) "Works," VIII, p.329. Cf. p.328, "this epidemick desire of wandering."

increasing the total number of departures. This attitude to emigration was not held consistently by the Edinburgh Review during the war years. A disinclination to governmental assistance is suggested in the disagreement with Talleyrand (see above page 196, note 1.) regarding the policy of ancient states ^{towards} emigration. The reviewer denies that their governments did more than permit their surplus peoples to go. Generally speaking, this periodical does not, before 1815, endorse the adoption of a policy of state-assistance to emigration. Regarding the restrictions of the mercantile system, still applied against the West Indies, the Whig organ speaks in no uncertain tones. The planter should be allowed to refine his sugar; ⁽¹⁾ his production costs would be lowered if he were conceded free commercial intercourse with America. To prohibit the distillation of corn by proclamation until forty days after the next opening of parliament, as a sop to planters who have overstocked their market, is economic folly. On the slave question this publication is also self-consistent and definitive. In July 1813, it insists on the registration of all British-owned slaves as in Trinidad. The colonial legislatures cannot be trusted to deal with slavery questions. "The system is incapable of reformation, except by the superintending wisdom and justice of the Imperial Parliament". ⁽²⁾ A propos of a review of Bentham's

(1) His being prohibited from doing so is "the most absurd part of the monopolizing system". Edinburgh Review, 1809, p. 404.

(2) Ibid., 21, p.474.

"Theory of Punishments", transportation as an aspect of colonial policy is roundly criticised.⁽¹⁾

On some aspects of the negro question the Quarterly Review is in thorough agreement with its northern rival. On that subject opinion continued to be powerfully influential on policy.⁽²⁾ There are phases of the commercial restrictions also which it reprobates equally strongly, for example the exclusion of British shipping from trade with India.⁽³⁾ Regarding the settlement of Britain's colonial possessions, the Quarterly Review goes farther than the opposition organ habitually does. Of South Africa, in particular, an article in July 1815 says, "The discouragement of colonial population is degrading to the age we live in, and unworthy of that liberal conduct which generally distinguishes the British Government."⁽⁴⁾ This, together with the endorsement of Lord Selkirk's project by the Edinburgh Review, would constitute a basis in opinion for a policy of regulation, and of assistance, at least in regard to information, for post-war emigration.

(1) By Dumont; *ibid.*, Oct. 1813, vol. 22, pp. 1 - 31.

(2) Quarterly Review, July 1815, vol. 13, pp. 338 - 340.

(3) "It is a manifest injustice and a national reproach that every foreigner in amity with Great Britain should be permitted to carry on an unlimited commerce with every part of India, while to Englishmen alone, all that lies beyond the Cape of Good Hope is to remain a forbidden land". *Ibid.* December 1812, Vol. 8, p. 258.

(4) *Ibid.*, vol. 13, p. 312. Thanks are added to Lord Caledon "for this first attempt at building a distant town." (George Town)

Colonial policy as it is adumbrated in the treaties of Paris and Vienna was , to a considerable extent, the result of the currents of British opinion which have been touched on in this chapter. The declaration regarding the scourge which "has so long desolated Africa, degraded Europe and afflicted humanity", the slave trade, was altogether the product of humanitarian sentiment upon government. The opinions of the economists are written large on the treaty. English diplomatists remembered that their clauses were to be scrutinised by leaders of commerce who now held with Bentham that Trade was the child of Capital. There was no reason for retaining Java, despite the unique constructive labours there of a gifted Englishman. Its products would find their way to British markets without pounds sterling being squandered for its civil and military administration. (1)

Key stations were ranked above productive areas, and ports of call above potential homes for the redundant population. The Cape was valued as a half-way house to India — a convalescent camp on the way home. Ceylon had a function, too, as a granary, which made it of value to the possessions in the East. The treaty reveals the fact that the colonies were classed second to India in the estimation of the government. There was some support for this preference in opinion. The cost of Indian administration did not fall, directly at any rate, on the state. (2)

(1) It might almost be thought that Sir Stamford Raffles learned a lesson from the treaty of peace. The next possession he acquired for Britain was a naval base, not an extensive colony.

(2) The retention of Malta perhaps best connotes the policy of the treaties. Of it, the Quarterly Review, vol.5, p.241, would say, as it says of Ceylon, "Our Empire is insular: and while we confine ourselves to islands we are secure."

In supporting the retention of Mauritius the public attitude was epitomised in the Quarterly Review. It found that the revenue of the island would probably more than defray the cost of the civil establishment, and that a small military garrison would suffice. The positive advantage, which the reviewer found in the possession of the island, lay in its commodious harbour advantageously situated as it was for the prosecution of "that important branch of commerce and navigation, the whale fishery".⁽¹⁾

The article just quoted closes, as this chapter may properly do, with a reference to Napoleon. The Quarterly reviewer (1811) exulted in his anticipated defeat; he might build "ships" he would lack "colonies and commerce". It reads like a reversion to the old colonial policy. Many, it is true, had not outgrown it. For years still, official spokesmen of the British Government were to reaffirm their confidence in the mercantile system. Napoleon laughed at the simple-mindedness of his easily-satisfied conquerors. Chatham had wrested the whole of French Canada. The consequences of the acquisition of that colony⁽²⁾ determined the moderation of Britain's^{attitude} in 1815. These fifty years had witnessed more theorising on colonial questions than Englishmen of earlier days were wont to indulge in. Perhaps it is safe to say that the failure to determine policy in accordance with the new super-abundant theory was as happy as the utter neglect of speculative programmes in the past had been unfortunate.

(1) Quarterly Review, Feb. 1811, vol. 5, p. 236. "The Cape of Good Hope is the colony on which British capital may be laid out to individual and national advantage." p. 240.

(2) John, Earl of Stair, in "An Address, etc.---" op. cit., p. 31, notes that the French comment generally on Britain's gaining Canada was "Grand bien leur fasse".

C H A P T E R VI.

EMIGRATION.

"On what the people think long, they customarily think right."
-Johnson.

"In nineteen days 1386 persons have emigrated from the West of Scotland in search of subsistence on the other side of the Atlantic." -Scots Magazine, IX, 1821.

Under "Chronology" in an early edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica are listed, with other noteworthy events of the year 1787, the sailing of two ships with black people to Sierra Leone, and of nine ships with convicts for Botany Bay. There is no reference to the departure of boat-loads of the deserving poor for whose welfare the faith, humanity and foresight of the government of the day were making provision in a new land.

In the years following the American War opinion held strongly to the view that the man-power of the country was falling off. Immediately prior to that time grave fears had been expressed. The speeches of Shelburne and Chatham, the writings of Johnson and Goldsmith had concurred regarding the danger. The gaps in the old villages made more impression, seemingly, than the thickening clusters of dwellings in the new towns. A bold peasantry had always been the country's pride. Its decay threatened not only the nation's defence, but also the nation's food supply. Johnson held not only that the flight of population was a loss to the state, but that criminals, instead of being transported, should be retained to make good by enforced exertions the injury and



expense their crimes and punishment had occasioned.

Emigration from England had caused little uneasiness before the American War. The administration had even encouraged it by the offer of land in the St. Lawrence valley to officers and men of the forces. This was set forth in the proclamation of October 7, 1763, which established a temporary government in Quebec. The other colonies, said an official paper of the period, were so full "as scarce to leave room in some of them for any more inhabitants!" Of the proposal to plant Germans in the new territories of the crown, it continued; "Our own reduced sailors and soldiers would be more proper objects of national bounty and better colonists than foreigners"⁽¹⁾. This offer was the exception rather than the rule: it is doubtful whether it was ever given a practical form, whether the national bounty did not remain a paper promise without causing the government any active concern. The act which reversed the constitutional clauses of the proclamation of 1763 was framed with positive intent to reserve Canada to its French and Indian inhabitants.⁽²⁾

Emigration had, on the other hand, seriously perturbed the authorities in Scotland. Horace Walpole noted the fact in 1778.⁽³⁾

(1) Sess. Paper, op.cit., pp.163f., and note re Calendar of Home Office Papers of the Reign of George III, 1760-1765, no. 349.

(2) See above p.57, note (1)

(3) "Scotland, for some years before the war, had complained of migrations to America, and having lately gone deep into manufactures and improvement of estates, must dislike further depopulation". "Last Journals," II, p.179.

Johnson's tour of the Highlands occasions some reflections on the wisdom of allowing landlords to increase their rents to the extent of driving out the country's inhabitants. (1) Although the writer had no love for the colonies, and no exact knowledge of America, he concedes that going in large parties, as the Highlanders were, the rough edge of exile would be taken off. They were carrying their language, their customs, their friends with them. He notes that they are not all of the lower orders: but that gentlemen of means migrated with them, their natural leaders. (2) In 1775, the Lord Advocate had entertained the idea of restoring the "old proprietors" to the estates forfeited as a result of the '45. This was with a view to restoring the relationship of chieftain and clansman, and staying the drift to America. The session of 1784 closed with the unanimous acceptance of Dundas' motion. In that year the Highland Society was organised to arouse public interest in the condition of the Highlands and Islands. Its ideals were at once romantic and humanitarian. At times they conflicted. Absentee landlordism was an evil, but sheep-farming was economically advantageous.

(1) "Works", op.cit., VIII, pp.326-330; 289; "The numbers which have already gone, though like other numbers they may be magnified, are very great". p.332. The learned doctor was in error in saying, "but in the Hebrides, the loss of an inhabitant leaves a lasting vacuity." See specific disproof re various islands, in the Edinburgh Review, 1805, VII, p.193.

(2) One example of many such is recorded in the Scots Mag., 1773, vol. 35, p.499, three gentlemen with 400 followers sailing for lands they had secured at Albany, N.Y. On p.557, sailings are mentioned - Stornoway 700, Maryburgh 425, Stromness 775. This is typical.

Both tended to suggest emigration to supernumerary workers. In later years obstructions were thrown in the way of those who would better their lot by emigration. The Passenger Act of 1803 was framed by the Society. It resulted in an increase in the cost of passages. The emigrant's food was specified: in its quantity and in its nature, it was far beyond what the clansmen were accustomed to. As a consequence their little stock of money was badly depleted before the expenses of the land journey began. In some cases where their going was stayed, a patriotic society's action was the unthinking cause of unnecessarily protracting the struggle for a bare existence. Emigration from Ireland before the American War according to Burke amounted to some 3,000 annually.

The independence of America naturally stiffened the opposition to emigration. What had been regarded as Britain's loss before, was now a rival's — and a potential enemy's — gain. The increasing demand of home industry for hands, in itself, was adequate ground for the strict conservation of the population. This was the more imperative, it seemed, that a recognised authority had proved a positive decline in numbers. The conten-

(1) Selkirk, "Observations of the Present State of the Highlands of Scotland", 1805, p.135, calls it the Emigration Regulation Bill.

(2) 43 Geo.III c.56. The ostensible purpose of the act was the safeguarding of the emigrant's interests. Lord Selkirk, op.cit, chap. X, passim, is the authority for the statement regarding its result. For his strictures of the Third Report of the Highland Society on Emigration(pp.13), see appendix I, p.L. See Edinburgh Review, 7, p.185.

(3) See above p.90. Mr. Newnham's calculation for the years 1771, 1772, 1773 was an average of 1533. Edin. Review, 12, p.342. S.C.Johnson, "Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America", 1913, gives the total emigration in the years following 1763, as c.20,000. annually.

(4) Dr. Price, "Essay on the Population of England" 1780.

(1)

tion was attacked by a writer of equal eminence. A number of pamphlets were written on the subject, and for some years the pros and cons of the argument figured prominently in the periodical literature. Franklin's statement that there were no fewer in England because America was populous was much quoted. What was considered its specious logic was attacked. It was maintained that what those who looked on emigration with some degree of allowance were bound to show was, not, that a man in America demanded as much goods of British manufacture as one at home, but that he

(2)

demanding more. To the present day student it appears that the supporters of the optimistic view regarding population had the better of the argument. But they were hopelessly outnumbered. People generally believed what the most voices, not the best logic supported.

Among the many who decried emigration were Lord Sheffield and Sir John Sinclair. The view of the former, that in 1780 Manchester alone could have employed 10,000 more hands, has been cited. (3) The latter advocated the use of surplus revenue for the encouragement of home industry and agriculture, rather than for the reduction of

(1) Rev. J. Howlett, "An Examination of Dr. Price's Essay", 1781, p.22, quotes Franklin referred to above with approval. See Gentleman's Magazine, 52, pt.II, pp.369, 473, 525.

(2) There is no clear recognition, at this period, of the truth established by Sidgwick, "The Elements of Politics", p.315, that to a certain definite extent emigration tends to stimulate the growth of population in the country of departure. Howlett approached the idea, after Franklin, with the figure of the polypus (the nation) which grows a new member where one is cut off. See also the Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1805, vol.7, p.193. and Malthus (1826) II, pp.518, 519.

(3) "Observations on American Commerce", p.26.

debt, confident that the development which would follow from the generous extension of bounties would best stay the tendency to

(1) emigrate. An anonymous eulogist of Sir George Savile showed how that humane parliamentarian had eased the situation of the subtenants on his Tyrone estates and prevented emigration. He had taken up expiring leases and re-let directly in allotments to the actual occupiers, saving them half the rents they had been subjected to for years by intermediary tenants. The statement published concerning this patriotic action concluded that, if others would follow the example, the linen industry would

(2) flourish. David Dale proved that manufacturers could be equally forward to ensure home conditions which would keep those who, otherwise, would have to emigrate. He gave employment to many such Highlanders, entertained them till they could find accommodation in Glasgow; even undertook to build houses for two hundred

(3) families. Henry Beaufoy, M.P., speaking to the Society for Extending the Fisheries, deplored, "above all, the spirit of emigration which still prevails from the Island of Sky (sic) to

(4) America!"

The fate of the unhappy emigrant was set forth that all who ran might read. No super-sensitiveness towards American feelings

(1) "History of the Public Revenue", 1785, pt.II, p.126.

(2) Letter signed "Ireland", Scots Magazine, 35, p.591.

(3) Letter to Colonel Dalrymple, Oct. 20, 1791, Scots Mag. 53, pp.513, 514.

(4) Gentleman's Magazine, 58, pt. II, 813.

softened the terms used of their country. The member of Parliament just quoted characterised the United States as "the bourne form which no traveller returns". A disappointed emigrant who alleged that he found its citizens waiting like spiders for their prey, described it as "the Botany Bay of the whole world."⁽¹⁾ In verse, too, was told the sufferings of the fondly deluded who ventured across the gulf of waters Providence had fixed.⁽²⁾

Not only did the journals give ample space to the woes of emigration: they tried definitely to check the spread of facts of an attractive nature regarding America. Consistently from 1783 onwards efforts are made 'to show up' the ulterior motives of those who endeavoured to induce emigrants overseas.⁽³⁾ Letters of protest against advertising Ohio valley lands are frequent. One who protested would have such seductive articles restrained by government.⁽⁴⁾ The same writer ironically urges that Adam Smith had shown how comfortable the position of the industrious labourer was, for the price of labour infallibly rose, *pari passu*, with the price of provisions. As a consequence of the general

(1) Gentleman's Magazine, 58, pt.II, 813.

(2) E.g. "The Peasant of Auburn or the Emigrant", by J. Coombe, D.D., a quarto volume, the dolorous narrative of one whose wife died and whose daughter was carried off by Indians.

"Thus Edwin mourned, pale, melancholy, slow,
Where wild Ohio's sounding waters flow."

See Gents. Mag. 53, pt.II, p.362. Cf. Thomas Campbell's "Gertrude of Wyoming"

(3) Gentleman's Magazine, 1783, 53, pt.II, p.1036.

(4) Ibid. 63, p.401: also 65, p.760.

attitude the, statements such as Franklin's to the Earl of Buchan (then Lord Cardross) regarding the opportunities for advancement awaiting the industrious in the former colonies are quite exceptional.⁽¹⁾

Official opinion regarding emigration during the later eighteenth century was, if anything, more inclined to direct departing Britons to the colonies still faithful to their allegiance than to coerce them into remaining. The report of the Committee on Convicts of July 28, 1785, maintained strongly that the proposed penal settlement, wherever it should be fixed, would not be capable of receiving a large consignment of felons annually and assimilating them, "unless it becomes a numerous and flourishing colony".⁽²⁾ Free settlers would have to be encouraged. The report suggested two means of securing them; by diverting "the Spirit of Emigration which leads so many British subjects annually to the United States," and by providing there for the "many American families (which) are desirous of settling in any healthy part of the globe where they can rely on the protection of the British government." Sir George Young in his recommendation of Botany Bay of a few months earlier was quite careful to minimise

(1) Dated Passy, March 17, 1783, but not published until July 1794; see Gentleman's Magazine, 64, p.587.

(2) "Commons Journals" 40, p.1164, see above p.130, and note (3) This report leaves no doubt about the opinion of the Committee regarding colonization. It was favourable. They were strongly impressed with the potentialities of the African coast approximately 29 S. 19 E., that is, the mouth of the Orange River (not on the Guinea coast: see the uncertainty in Rose, op.cit., pt.I, p.435) They believed it healthy, rich in minerals (copper), inhabited by natives amicably disposed to whites, favourably situated alike as a port of call en route to India, for trade with Brazil, and for the Falkland Islands whale fishery. True, allowance should be made, in applying their enthusiasm to colonization generally, for the necessity under which the Committee laboured, of finding a site for a particular type of colony.

(1)

the necessity for any emigrants from Britain. Pitt's abortive poor law proposals of 1797 brought out that statesman's views regarding the benefit conferred on the community by the father of a large family. From the Vicar of Wakefield to the prime minister of England the consensus of opinion was that an increasing population was a distinct national advantage to be safeguarded as much as possible from such a drain as emigration. If people had to leave, it was conceded, but without any very strong conviction as yet, that it were better that they should go to the remaining colonies.

The actual departures from Britain during the twenty years from the Peace of Versailles to that of Amiens were not in themselves material. What did matter was the reputation given to those who went. (2) To a very large extent their destination was the United States. The national attitude to the republic during the first of these decades was, all too generally, one of jealous bitterness. The colonists had been treated as social inferiors before the outbreak of hostilities. (3) On them, during the struggle fell the resentment of the nation, resentment which rose largely

(1) See above pp. 128, 129.

(2) Sheffield, op.cit., p.193, note, wrote: "Emigration is the natural resource of the culprit, and of those who have made themselves the objects of contempt and neglect: but it is by no means necessary to the industrious. It is generally conceded that not above one emigrant in five succeeds so as to settle a family."

(3) See above pp. 18, note (3) and 19.

from the knowledge of corrupt inefficiency beyond the people's power to bring to judgment. Colonial success intensified English resentment in proportion as it mortified English pride. Phantom fears were conjured up after one passing impulse towards thorough reconciliation;⁽¹⁾ fears that the carrying trade would be lost, that British manufactures would be displaced. With France, Britain promptly concluded an unprecedentedly comprehensive commercial alliance. But Britain and her one-time colonies -

"They stood apart, the scars remaining."

Ten years of estrangement brought the French Revolution. The politico-social differences between the monarchy and the republic were at once greatly intensified. Tom Paine - and America, was an instinctive association. Yet, to America, some thousands of Britons, largely perforce, turned their faces. Those on whom the blows of circumstance had not fallen, looked on askance. 'Emigrant' became a term of reproach. It meant poverty, or if not, ingratitude - a Briton base enough to carry his money to enrich a raw, uncouth democracy. As he passed westward, the emigrant's form was distorted by the low-lying mists of jealousy which intervened between England and America. The connotation which the words colonist and emigrant acquired during these years lasted long after the United States ceased to be the one country which offered new opportunities; lasted far into the period in which increasing numbers and increasing want made it doubly necessary for Britons

(1) See above pp. 29, 30.

to emigrate.

The motives which induced to emigration are deserving of a
 (1) brief examination. It must first be realised that, at that time,
 crossing the Atlantic meant something extremely difficult for the
 (2) twentieth century mind to grasp. The word 'exile', perhaps, best
 suggests the finality, the separation, the utter woe of it. When
 Johnson asked his Highland host if his compatriots would emigrate
 if their lot were made eligible here, the Scot asked indignantly
 (3) if a man ever willingly left his native land. It is safe to assume
 that the great majority of eighteenth century Britons who crossed
 the sea were forced to do so. Combined with constraint, however, w
 was usually found an attraction: they were both driven and led.
 Both forces appeared in many forms. The most common attraction,
 and probably the most powerful one, was good news from friends
 who had braved the parting and had prospered or saw prosperity
 (4) ahead of them. This impulse to emigration became increasingly

(1) S.C.Johnson, op.cit., chap.III gives three causes of emigration. The division is not altogether logical. Unemployment would cover the first four, and the two last are classed as minor.

(2) "To emigrate implies a degree of violence to many of the strongest feelings of human nature; a separation from a number of connexions dear to the heart; a dereliction of the attachments of which few can resolve upon without the spur of necessity," Selkirk, op.cit., p.170. (youth)

(3) Johnson, "Works", VIII, p.251.

(4) Ibid. p.327; Selkirk, op.cit., pp.164, 167, 169, and reviews of the same, Gents.Mag., 76, pt.I, p.233; Scots Mag. 67, p.609, and Edinburgh Review, 7, p.199, "gregarious affection has directed them to the United States".

powerful as emigration continued. In early years, when a few had settled in the colonies, it was easy enough to discredit the reports they sent. ⁽¹⁾ Later, their numbers, their respectability, would not be denied credence. Public opinion listened, for the good and sufficient reason that the majority was now in touch, in varying degrees of proximity, with the colonies, personally in touch through friends and acquaintances. When this had come about rulers might frame what measures they chose to enable them to meet the inevitable separation fore-armed; the very unity of the peoples, that of the mother-country with those of the colonies, determined that there should be no separation. The influence of schools of thought, individualism in its various forms, was powerful. It swayed policy as one aspect of opinion. A counter current springing more directly from the people, human where the other was logical, concrete, not speculative, proved the stronger. But the opinion which prevailed was not without assistance from definite leaders - men who took thought that emigration should be directed, in the interest, now of the home-land, and, again, of the colony. A school of thought arose which worked with the imperial instinct behind emigration. To its leaders, the origin and influence of their ideas, the remaining chapters of this study will be devoted.

(1) This was accomplished to a great extent in England during the period in question. In Scotland recommendations of the new world were less susceptible to repression than they were circulated mainly by word of mouth. Warning articles were printed, however, e.g. Scots Magazine, 34, p.483.

CHAPTER VII.

ROBERT FLEMING GOURLAY.

"Sorry am I, that worn out with sickening cares and adversity, my powers of execution have fallen short of their object, and have become too feeble for the mighty cause which I desire to plead, - the cause of the English poor and of a benighted province of the British Empire." -Robert Gourlay. (1)

"Mr. Gourlay, whose name cannot be mentioned without feelings of deep indignation at all who caused and permitted his ruin - the excellent and able Mr. Gourlay, did much towards the exposure of the old system, the demolition of which will be one great benefit to spring from the new views." -Saxe Bannister. (2)

The influence of Robert Fleming Gourlay has been curiously neglected. His contemporaries^{ar} regarded him as a crank. Self-described he was a "political projector".⁽³⁾ Lord Eldon is reported to have said that if he had had life to live over again he would have been an agitator: as such Gourlay saw scant result for his efforts. "My fortune, my character, my health have suffered in the cause."⁽⁴⁾ He espoused many causes - the tithe, better farming, Edinburgh improvement - but that to which he here refers was the 'be all' and 'end all' of his life, "a Grand System of Emigration in connection with a Reform of the Poor Laws". With this in view he compiled his "Statistical Account of

(1) "Statistical Account of Upper Canada compiled with a view to a Grand System of Emigration in connection with a Reform of the Poor Laws." 2 vols., London, 1822; "General Introduction" to the same, later in that year, by the same publishers, Simpkin and Marshall. Introduction p. CCCLXXII.

(2) "British Colonization", p. 204.

(3) Introduction, p. CCCLXVI.

(4) Ibid. p. XLVIII.

(1) Upper Canada." His volumes contain "a very store-house of
 (2) Canadian facts". Scattered through his rambling, autobiographical pages, and mixed with searching but ill-advised polemics on the abuses of an arbitrary executive, are indications of a real grasp of the situation, both at home, and in the colony. It will be shown that the suggestions that he made regarding colonization and liberal government in the Canadas were invaluable to Wakefield and his school of Colonial Reformers. The extent of this indebtedness makes it the more regrettable that no formal
 (3) acknowledgment of it was ever placed on record.

The problem of the Poor Law he knew thoroughly. Arthur Young, he says, "flattered me twenty years ago by saying that I 'knew more
 (4) of the poor of England than any man in it'". Gourlay had been employed by the Board of Agriculture "to inquire into means for
 (5) bettering the condition of the poor." The results of his investigations over a period of fifteen months in Rutland and Lincolnshire were used to establish Young's theory of the feasibility of the "Cow system" of making amends to worthy cottagers whose interests
 (6) suffered by the enclosing of commons. Gourlay protested against

(1) He confesses frankly that he hoped by his book to further his own personal interests as a land agent. It is manifest that sincere philanthropy was a powerful motive with him.

(2) M.F. Conolly, "Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Men of Fife." 1866. p.199.

(3) Regarding a private acknowledgment as reported by Gourlay see Mills, "The Colonization of Australia (1829-1842)", 1915, p.139.

(4) Gourlay, "Introduction", p. CLXXII.

(5) Ibid. p.CCCLXVI.

(6) "An Inquiry into the state of the Cottagers in the counties of Lincoln and Rutland." Acknowledging his indebtedness to Gourlay, Young says in the "Annals of Agriculture", as cited on the next page "This work was never favoured, perhaps, with a more important communication."

the unauthorised publication in the Annals of Agriculture ⁽¹⁾ of some "undigested notes" ⁽²⁾ which made him appear "as an advocate of Young's system". They drew the attention of Edward Wakefield, senior. He disagreed with the views attributed to Gourlay, but did so deferentially. "From my personal knowledge of that gentleman", he writes, "I am inclined to pay very great attention to his opinion, for few have seen so much of England in a practical way as this intelligent North Briton". ⁽³⁾ Gourlay throughout displays a consistent belief in first-hand knowledge. On one occasion the hardships of the labourers breaking stones on the highway induced him to share their toil, "with the philosophic object of ascertaining what kind of work it was." To the contemporary quoted, this adventure in "living on sixpence a day, and working for it" seemed ⁽⁴⁾ ludicrous. Gourlay's essentially modern method of getting acquainted with social problems brought on his head more telling criticism than that of the casual acquaintance of his old age who lightly sketched his eccentric career. This same stone-breaking exploit was the basis on which in the House of Commons, Joseph Hume, M.P. confirmed the report that Gourlay was, at times deranged. ⁽⁵⁾

(1) Vol. 37, p.154. Cf. Young's letter in "Farmer's Journal" of 16 Sept. 1816, and his "Agricultural State of the Kingdom", 1816, pp.8, 12. See also Gourlay, "Introduction", pp.XCI-XCVI. Cunningham op.cit., p.714, note refers to Gourlay's researches in this connection particularly.

(2) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.LXXXVIII. Cf. pp.XC-XCI, & notes

(3) E. Wakefield, "Statistical Account of Ireland", vol.2, p.812, quoted in Gourlay, "Introduction", p.LXXXVIII, f. foot-note.

(4) Conolly, op.cit., p.199.

(5) And this inspite of the fact that Gourlay's "Upper Canada" is dedicated in manly terms to Joseph Hume, M.P. Cf. Scots Magazine 1824, XV, p.502.

In 1809, he removed from his Fifeshire home to Deptford Farm, Wiltshire, "chiefly with a view practically to study the poor law".⁽¹⁾ He rented farm land for the Duke of Devonshire, his investment extending to £6000. At that time he entertained "fair hopes of independent fortune."⁽²⁾ His father's seeming affluence justified his devoting much of his time to social and political agitation. His restless spirit found some outlet too in "high farming." It is characteristic of him that he shortly challenged the county to three contests - to demonstrate the folly, of employing eight-year-old children to drive plough horses, of sowing turnips broadcast, and, of using other than a pre-arranged rotation of crops.⁽³⁾ For this quixotic enterprise he gives what is a surprisingly valid reason, - and gives it in the document which conveys the challenge. It is dated November 21, 1814. The Corn Bill had just been mooted. He writes that,

"the parliamentary reports have come forth stuffed with ex-parte evidence and self-imposing plausibility, manifesting a steady purpose on the part of landed proprietors, to press upon the legislature selfish and factitious expedients."

He knows that all attempts to induce his brother farmers to "touch the main springs of government - to be virtuously independent and to enlarge independence and security, would be vain." Accordingly he confines his effort to the practical contests mentioned, "to the manual of agriculture" because "here it is better to do a little than to be idle." For two years he had

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCLXVI.

(2) Ibid. p.XXX.

(3) Ibid. p.VII - XI, foot-note.

interfered but little in parochial management. When he became an overseer of poor relief, he succeeded in raising the rate at which the subsistence level was set to twelve shillings a week.

(1) His views on the general practice of holding down the wages of husbandry - which he suggests is a virtual contravention of the Combination Acts - also helped to turn the farming and land-owning classes against him.

He seems to have gloried in the unequal contest. His ready pen drafted two petitions (2) to Parliament on behalf of the poor.

His pamphlets on Poor Law Reform were printed and posted to every member of the House of Commons and to every peer. In the winter of 1814 - 1815 he proposed a convention of farmers' delegates "with a view to getting something substituted in place

(3) of the corn bill". He classifies the panaceas generally talked

of as, debasing the coinage, lowering the rate of interest and sweeping off the national debt by a levy of fifteen percent on

(4) every species of property. He advocates disbanding 50,000 soldiers abolishing sinecures, economising in all departments, scaling down leases proportionately to the fall in the price of corn, commuting tithes, getting "quit" of corn laws and, gradually, throwing "open our ports to free commerce". He protested against the ill-logic of attributing the prevailing depression to "the transition from war

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", P. CIX.

(2) (a) presented by Mr. Methuen M.P. 31 May, 1815. Ibid., p.CXXIX.

(b) presented by Mr. Methuen M.P. 28 February, 1817, Ibid.P.CXLVI, having been declined by Sir F. Burdett, Lord Cochrane and Lord Folkestone.

(3) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCXXV.

(4) Ibid. p.CXLVIII; Wakefield, "England and America", I, p.46 includes these among nineteen remedies which he lists as having been advocated. Cf. Quarterly Review, March 1828, p.558.

to peace." (1) A law suit with his landlord, coupled with the fall in prices, hastened his financial ruin. His father's estates (2) preceded his own into the hands of the official receiver. Early in 1817 he set out for Upper Canada.

He carried with him his plans for ameliorating the condition of the poor in Great Britain and Ireland. He had "a hope of rendering Upper Canada the grand receptacle for the redundant population" of the mother country. (3) Like Lord Durham two decades later, he had his scheme ready in advance; like him, he was to find that local conditions required that it be carefully revised.

He visited the Perth Settlement of 1815 and made a detailed inventory (4) of the progress, in its first thirteen months, of every colonist, a device to be copied by Peter Robinson and developed in full in the Reports of the Emigration Committees of 1826, and 1827. He found the emigrants making slow headway, but each one signed as "well satisfied". Conditions in Bathurst, Drummond, Beckwith and Gouldburne where the military colonists were located by Lieutenant-Colonel Cockburn in 1816 and 1817 were less promising. (5)

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p. CXLVII.

(2) Conolly, op.cit., p. 199 says inspite of the "law's delays" they paid 18/10½ in the £.

(3) Gourlay, vol. II, p. 470. Elsewhere he seems to suggest that the scheme occurred to him in Canada, e.g. "Introduction", p. VI

(4) Ibid. I, p. 524 -525. Cf. "Introduction", p. CCCCX-CCCCXI.

(5) Ibid. I, p. 520 f.

Gourlay made critical notes on the blunders which each attempt at settlement revealed. With an appreciation of the fitness of things he seldom displayed, he refrained from making these errors the text of his first "Address to the Resident Landowners of Upper Canada".⁽¹⁾ In that moderate and restrained pronouncement he stated his purpose of compiling a statistical account of Upper Canada with a view to encouraging British immigration. He introduced the questionnaire he was sending to each township with becoming modesty, and deft comment on his faith in their "energy and public spirit" for careful replies. He made out his case with a touch of genius.⁽²⁾ He had "struck a chord which appealed to the public".⁽³⁾ The Township Reports were almost without exception truly and well returned. Gourlay maintained "that they should be weighed even by the statesman, while he studies the future fate of a very extensive portion of the British Empire - a portion which must be with us, or off from us, just as opinion turns, and as respect is paid to it."⁽⁴⁾

The questions he asked were thirty-one in number. The present day reader finds them perfectly innocuous. A hundred years ago, in Upper Canada, it was anything but harmless to ask - "No. 31. What in your opinion retards the improvement of your township in particular or the province in general, and what would most contribute to

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", pp. CLXXXVI - CXCVI.

(2) Kingsford, "History of Canada", IX, p.214.

(3) Gourlay, I, pp.269 - 625.

(4) Ibid., II, p.402.

(1) the same?" Gourlay claims that the administrator of the province, Colonel Smith, approved of his Address, and of his list of

(2) questions. It is certain that the acting Lieutenant-Governor refrained from taking action against him for some time after being first urged to do so. Gourlay, however, was congenitally unable to inhibit the desire to rush into print regarding governmental ineptitude. While waiting for returns from the queries addressed to the townships, he made a tour through the western portion of the province. By observation he learned what reforms were urgently needed. His first knowledge of the political condition of the country had been acquired from his association with Barnabas Bidwell during the previous summer. (3)

From Queenstown, February 1818, he wrote his second Address. He assumed the role of champion; Upper Canada had been too long "the spoil of Arbitrary power". In particular he attacked the constitutionality of the executive's exclusion of would-be (4) immigrants from the United States, while 30 Geo. III c.27 still stood. He drafted petitions to the provincial legislature, but none would dare to father them. Twice he was tried for sedition, (5) twice he defended himself, and twice he was honourably acquitted.

(1) See Appendix IV, p. 419, for reply of Sandwich township; cf signatures attached as indicative of respectability of correspondents

(2) Gourlay, "Introduction", p. CXCVI; Kennedy, v p. 133, says that Powell C.J. also approved. (cited below)

(3) One-time Attorney-General of Massachusetts. Cf. Kennedy, "Constitution of Canada", 1922, p. 131; Kingsford, op.cit., XI, p. 211

(4) Gourlay, II, 434-436. See comment p. 456. It was the Assembly's criticism of the exclusion of Americans which occasioned its summary prorogation by Lieut-Gov. Gore, April 7, 1817. This was before Gourlay's arrival in the province.

(5) Ibid., "Introduction", p. VIII.

When the Assembly of the spring of 1818 was prorogued after a brief, profitless session, he issued a third Address to the Resident Landowners. ⁽¹⁾ They must act for themselves; a convention of delegates, a committee to lay the state of the province before the Imperial Authorities, and a Commission of Inquiry to set matters right were the means he urged. Despite the opposition of erstwhile friends now fearful of incurring official displeasure, Gourlay got district meetings held, and delegates appointed, generally throughout the South and West. He was indefatigable. By wagon he made his way to the extreme east of the province advertising the convention with pamphlets and by word of mouth.

The delegates convened at York. By this time Sir Peregrine Maitland, the new Lieutenant-Governor, had arrived in the province, his father-in-law, the Duke of Richmond coming as Governor of the Lower Province. Gourlay had "conceived favourable impressions of their liberality". He judged that his agitation had gone far enough to make the need of inquiry obvious. He "advised the Convention to refer its cause to the Lieutenant-Governor and General Assembly". ⁽²⁾ Though the "people were now sanguine that all would go well", the Lieutenant-Governor, by adroit procedure, secured the enactment of a measure which declared such meetings of delegates unlawful. Those who had been so injudicious as to act for their respective districts in attending the late convention were to be penalised in due course; Gourlay suffered at once. An

(1) 2, April, 1818, *ibid.*, II, pp.581 -587.

(2) *Ibid.* "Introduction", p.VIII.

ignorant assembly-man swore contrary to common knowledge that he had not resided in the province for six months. As a seditious character, accordingly, under a provincial statute of 44 Geo.III he was ordered to leave the country. He refused to comply, was imprisoned and closely confined throughout the intensely hot summer of 1819. Chief Justice William Dummer Powell remanding Gourlay to await his trial, endorsed the back of the writ of Habeas Corpus with a statement to the effect that bail was not allowable under the Act and that the writ of commitment was in order. (1) Gourlay's health broke down under the strain. When his case came up his nervous condition was such that he was not responsible for his actions. He was tried, not on a charge of sedition, but on that of not having obeyed the order to leave the country. Twenty-four hours were given in which to comply with the repeated injunction.

Gourlay was treated with gross injustice. In 1842 the Canadian Parliament removed the stigma from his name by declaring the action against him unconstitutional. "Even those who judge him most severely, at least in modern times, acquit him of all interested motives." (2) With due allowance for the exaggerated strain in which he wrote, his statement may be accepted as strictly true, - "I saw before me a great political end, honourable to myself, profitable to you, and glorious to the nation." (3)

(1) Ibid. "Introduction", p.XLIII. In the foot-note Gourlay denies having demanded bail.

(2) Kingsford, op.cit., IX, p.211; Kennedy, op.cit., p.136.

(3) Postscript to second Address to the Resident Landowners written February 12, 1818. Gourlay, II, p.555.

Incidentally, and with perfect legitimacy, he sought the rehabilitation of his fortunes. He frankly avows that he "had a scheme for establishing a land agency in union with a newspaper."⁽¹⁾

Indirectly he contributed very effectually to righting matters in "the benighted province." He had aroused the rank and file of the colony.⁽²⁾ He was the first of a line of agitators for popular reform which culminates with Mackenzie and rebellion. But it was in Britain rather than Upper Canada that his influence on colonial policy was to count for most.

So far Gourlay has been treated as an eccentric poor law expert compelled to seek his fortunes in a misgoverned colony, a province seemingly intended to receive the mother country's redundant population. Such an opportunity for England's poor fanned his zeal for them into flame. "From beginning to end," he says in reference to his two and a half years in Canada, "all that was enthusiastic in conduct, arose from my mind getting more and more enraptured with the idea of stirring up public notice to my scheme of emigration"⁽³⁾. His onslaught on the executive was shaped to this end. Grievances were patent, - abuses in the wild lands department, manifold checks to progress in the crown and clergy reserves, faulty principles of taxation, narrow-minded exclusion of Americans, backward public works, the whole negative attitude of government

(1) Ibid. II, p.470.

(2) An exception should be made of John Mills Jackson^{whose} "View of the Political Situation of the Province", 1809, brings out the evils of the arbitrary executive exercised in Upper Canada in strong relief. Though the pamphlet was not circulated in the province, it was, on March 10, 1810, voted "a false, scandalous, and seditious LIBEL" by the House of Assembly. See Gourlay II, pp.317 -335.

(3) Ibid., "Introduction", p.CLXXXIII.

where a progressive policy was essential. All-round improvement, he maintained, was necessary before capital could be expected to flow in from the mother-land. ⁽¹⁾ He was right in his analysis, that the evils were so deep-seated that only the Imperial Government could deal effectively with them. What he proposed was, in effect, a radical change in colonial policy. A commission of inquiry was the method through which improvement finally came - but in the fourth decade of the century not the second. His contribution to the reform movement in the colony has been alluded to. It remains to develop his proposals regarding colonization and government, which, incorporated in his book and repeated in a number of petitions to Parliament, finally found more effective expression in his successors, the Colonial Reformers. His claim to a place among these systematic colonisers will then be apparent.

Like Wakefield and Durham, at least in their first reaction to the Canadian problem, Gourlay found the great stumbling block to colonial development in the evils of the land-granting department. His criticism is based definitely on the condition of affairs as he found it. He adverts to, without dilating on, the extravagant gifts of wild lands in the past, for example, to General Amherst's descendants. He erred, perhaps, in such cases, in assigning the blame too largely to the colonial executive. To refrain from unduly raking over the ill-advised generosity of the past was judicious. It could profit nothing. It is not

(1) "Hands no doubt are necessary, but, next to good laws, the grand requisite for the improvement of any country is capital." "Introduction", p. CLXXXVIII. Wakefield, on the other hand, put labour first in the list of things needed by the colonies. "England and America." II, p. 110.

suggested that Gourlay's historical sense was lacking. His work pays ample tribute to the view that a political situation is best understood in the light of its beginnings. His "Upper Canada", especially volume two, is stocked almost to repletion with Orders-in-Council, debates in the House of Commons, and statutes, imperial and provincial,⁽¹⁾ the bare enumeration of which would be tedious. To illustrate his appreciation of the genesis of evils in the government of Canada, his criticism of Fox is suggestive. That critic of the Act of 1791 has occasion, in the debates on the measure, to reflect on the mode of appointing legislative councillors, on the number of assembly-men provided for, on the allotment of lands for a Protestant clergy, yet, "makes not a single inquiry as to the disposal of wild lands".⁽²⁾ It is the profusion of a recent day in this department, rather than the extravagance of the past that he reprehends most severely. The assignment of smaller areas to more numerous favourites in the end had a more damaging effect. That it was the practice of grantees to expect their land to be broken into parcels so that the industry of actual settlers between their virgin tracts might enhance the value of of their holdings, Gourlay had confirmed to him by personal experience. When he enquired regarding a settlement on the Talbot plan,⁽³⁾ as he understood it, he learned that a hundred acres was the extent of land which could be allotted to him.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Gourlay, II, pp.1 - 292; Appendix I, pp.I → XLIX.

(2) Ibid., II, p.302. (3) Ibid., II, p.460 note.

(4) Sept. 14, 1817. Letter to Sir John Sherbrooke and reply. Ibid. II, pp.557, 558.

(1)
The officer in charge of the Perth settlement offered Gourlay a thousand acres, "the lots lying asunder". To his protest against the subdivision it was replied, "that it is more in your favour, as it becomes valuable from the efforts of the other settlers".

The settlements' handicap in the scattered blocks of clergy and crown reserved lands, Gourlay set out fully. (2) A plan of an Upper Canada township inset with one of his four maps reveals the situation at a glance. (3) The consensus of opinion in the province, well illustrated in the Township Reports, reprobated the continuance in further surveys of such allocations. Gourlay tried to bring the matter home to the Imperial Government in his petitions. In the third of a series of letters to Earl Bathurst, in reply to all of which uniform formal negatives were in due course received, Gourlay is over-sanguine regarding the ease with which the Colonial Secretary could solve the Clergy Reserve question. It is a serious reflection on his appreciation of the practical difficulties of government that he had no doubt the amendment necessary "could readily be accomplished during the next session of Parliament". (4) There is, on the other hand, unmistakable contact with reality in his delineation of the stifling effect on the backwoods

(1) Captain Fowler. See Gourlay, II, pp.561 -562.

(2) Cf. abstract of township reports, Appendix IV p.419
Gourlay uses the familiar figure of the dog in the manger here. Wakefield, "England and America", II, p.124, referring to the injury to settlers adjacent to these reserves, says, "it is as if the dog had bitten the cattle, besides hindering them from eating the hay."

(3) Facing frontispiece, vol. I.

(4) Ibid., "Introduction", p.CCXCVII.

pioneer of the adjacent forests, withheld from his would-be neighbour's improving by the claims of government clients and prospective rectories. "Actual settlers were stuck in this place or that, but no sooner were they fixed down than they were surrounded with reserves and blocks given away to drones and absentees" (1)

The terms of his bargain required the settler to chop out the roadway across half the front of his hundred acres. The best effort of the industrious could make, at first, only a passable trail. But even a trail to be of use labours under the disadvantage of having to be continuous. With no labour forthcoming on the lot opposite or adjoining, an undue burden was thrown on energy for which there was more than ample work of the same nature on the outskirts of the narrow home clearing. The isolation from markets, from what Wakefield calls "combinable labour", from social intercourse, proved humanly and economically stultifying. The ignorance and the sloth which Gourlay deploras in themselves, and relatively to the alert spirit of enterprise he found in the republic to the south, he correctly attributes in large measure to such a system of land-survey and alienation as rendered almost hopeless the struggle of petty communities to create roads for themselves. Short-sighted policy subsequent to Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe's tenure of office had left in the road question a legacy of evil. That energetic governor had planned a provincial highway, Dundas Street, (2) from

(1) Gourlay, II, pp.444, 445.

(2) Ibid., I, map facing frontispiece. Regarding Simcoe's policy generally, see excerpt from the Duke de la Rochefoucault Liancourt's "Travels through North America in the Years 1794, '95, '96" Gourlay II, pp.127 - 202.

east to west through the province. This lent attractiveness to prospective settlement in Upper Canada, and gave point to his proclamation offering free land to immigrants.⁽¹⁾ The Act of 30 Geo. III c.27⁽²⁾ had provided that Americans desirous of settling in the British North American Colonies should be actively encouraged, the oath of allegiance being tendered to each "immediately after his arrival", (clause III). General Simcoe was clearly implementing the policy of the home government in so energetically attracting settlers. What, asks Gourlay, can be said in defence of the repudiation of his agreements by his successors in office? The settlers who had located here and there along the proposed thorough-fare were left in broken communities,⁽³⁾ and the promise of government dwindled to what was barely strong enough to induce "the friends of the people in power" to seize the ungranted lands along the intended road. Hope so deferred finds an analogy still in Canada. Prairie settlers induced to locate well back from the trunk lines of travel by the promise of a railroad, wait in like growing despair the joining up the broken line on the map which continues to describe "their" railroad as still "projected".^{yet} A Ford car finds a way around sloughs, and scorns a made road: what the plight of the Upper Canadians who carried their grist for fifty miles on their backs must have been present day conditions faintly suggest.

(1) 7 February, 1792. Gourlay, II, pp.446 - 449, foot-notes.

(2) Given in full, *ibid.*, II, 434 - 436; cf "Introduction," CXXVII.

(3) *Ibid.*, II, p.454.

Having touched on the lavish alienation of crown lands, and the unredeemed pledges, of the past, Gourlay attacked the land-granting department of his day as a hot-bed of political corruption. To "ruinous patronage" he ascribes "the wretched condition of Upper Canada".⁽¹⁾ He cites the case of the acquisition of "the best landing-place for goods on the Niagara River" and "a right to the whole water-power of the rapids" by Mr. Samuel Street and his partner.⁽²⁾ The individuals in question were the most respectable in the province; "the system which permits such excess of favouritism is alone to blame." Not only did corrupt influence through the wild lands office secure the reward of party favourites: it was used to punish the slightest suspicion of a critical tendency. Gourlay had two notorious instances of its punitive use brought immediately to his attention during his short stay in the province. The one was personal: the other public.

On his arrival he had written home glowing accounts of the colony's possibilities. His younger brother, whose "apprenticeship to a Writer to the Signet" was "nearly served out" was despatched to join him. He applied for land in the usual way at York. "Instead of getting land, he had, after remaining in the province more than two months, a most insolent reply."⁽³⁾ At this time Gourlay was still generally in favour. But it seems that

[1] Gourlay, II, p.311.

[2] Ibid., II, pp.504 - 506.

[3] Ibid., II, p.418.

(1)

something in his first Address to the Resident Landowners, which has been described as unusually moderate and decorous, had savoured of the undesirable to the Reverend Dr. Strachan. The latter was a member of the land-council. Gourlay's inference that the treatment accorded his brother resulted from "the busy malice of the parson of Little York" would seem in the light of his later attitude to Gourlay to be well founded.

A completely verified vindictive use of the department by the highest executive authority in the province testifies unequivocally to the general policy. The delegates who had been so "indiscreet" as to attend Gourlay's convention at York, hoping by means of frank resolutions and a loyal petition to the House of Commons to bring about imperial investigation, "were a body of entirely respectable men".⁽²⁾ They were largely veterans of the late war, whose general loyalty should have been unquestioned, Yet to such lengths was repression held to be essential, was the vindictiveness of the jealous hierarchy of officials willing to go, that Sir Peregrine Maitland was encouraged to withhold from such delegates the lands tardily provided by the imperial authorities for militia service.⁽³⁾

Gourlay finds the department fraught with the minor defects of sloth and dilatoriness, incompetence, and red-tape. He quotes

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", pp. CLXXXVI - CXCVI.

(2) Kennedy, op.cit., p.132.

(3) See opening speech Provincial Legislature, 7 June, 1819 Gourlay, "Introduction", pp. CCCXCVII - CCCXCVIII.

Lord Dalhousie's speech to the Parliament of Lower Canada, on the opening of the winter session of 1820 - 21, regarding "the great tide of emigration to these provinces", and "the want of some measure to regulate ----- this growing strength". Gourlay continues, "at this very time ----- hundreds of emigrants were going from the province, from the mere sloth and indifference of men paid salaries to give attention to business in the land-granting department".⁽¹⁾ "Immigrants, desirous of securing their location tickets", wrote an indignant settler of earlier days who watched with disgust the continuance of the wretched system, "were compelled to dance attendance at York" for weeks and months together.⁽²⁾ In the United States, on the contrary, the sale of land was transacted expeditiously, and the deed was promptly forthcoming. Twenty years later the appendix on Crown Lands of the Durham Report justified Gourlay's strictures on the personnel and policy of the land-granting department.

Gourlay's criticism reviews the recent attempts at settlement in the province. The betrayal of the Simcoe immigrants involved in the discontinuance of the Dundas Street policy has been alluded to. Vacillating counsels continued. The settlers of 1817⁽³⁾ were denied the provisions and tools provided by the government for two their fellows of the preceding years. Costly blunders added

(1) Gourlay, II, p.562.

(2) Ibid., II, p.418; cf. I, p.378.

(3) Ibid., II, p.418; cf. I, p.523, "To the Editor of any British Newspaper", dated Queenstown, Upper Canada, Sept. 15, 1817.

unduly to the expense of such assisted emigration from the mother country. The Perth settlers were delayed a full year in reaching

(1) their Ottawa Valley homes. Meantime they were maintained in idleness. Gourlay contended rightly that such mismanagement brought colonization projects into disrepute alike with possible emigrants and the home authorities. (2) He pointed out that the

comparative lack of progress in the veteran settlements was due as much to their semi-military requirements as to the inherent

(3) "incapacity of the settlers". He supported his contentions in on (4) this particular with notes, made a tour in the Genesee district

of the United States, a hundred miles east of Niagara. There he found one of the most flourishing townships settled almost wholly by Highlanders of the same stock as the Cockburn colonists of 1817. The facts he gives regarding the 1803 Selkirk community on Lake Sinclair (St. Clair) and of the Talbot settlement on Lake Erie upheld his main thesis - that the average able-bodied emigrant, given a little authentic information and such assistance as might naturally be expected from intelligent civil servants, could be counted on to make good eventually. What Birkbeck was doing in Ohio, government could do on a much larger scale on the equally fertile lands of Upper Canada provided that care and (5) forethought were exercised.

(1) Gourlay, II, p.527.

(2) Wakefield, "England and America", II, p.101.

(3) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CLXXXVI.

(4) Cf. the references of Colonel Torrens to this district speaking in the House of Commons, February 13, 1827, reprinted in "Systematic Colonization", 1849, p.53.

(5) Ibid. p.54.

"The Grand System of Emigration in connection with a Reform of the Poor Laws", to which his "Upper Canada" and a very fair portion of his life were given, is not developed in a fashion commensurate with the full-rounded phrases in which he constantly refers to it. Addressing himself "to the People of England" in one of his most sustained bits of exposition, he maintains that, instead of the "annual charge" which the colonies constitute, Britain "might draw from them a considerable revenue merely by the economical distribution of waste-lands."⁽¹⁾ "England could spare 50,000 people annually and be refreshed with the discharge." "It requires but systematic arrangement, and the judicious application of capital which we have in abundance". With this, within scant fifteen pages, are given his constructive ideas regarding colonial government. Concerning emigration his provoking last word is, "should the public happily conceive favourable opinions of schemes now hinted at, it shall be my utmost ambition to go on to practical illustration and detail."⁽²⁾ He seemed to live in fear of his theories being filched from him. Yet scattered through his work are the pregnant suggestions which, given cohesion and some amplification, constitute a large portion of the self-consistent system of the Wakefieldian school. An effort will be made in what follows to bring together his thoughts, first on colonization, then on government.

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCXXXV. Cf. Appendix

(2) Cf. the suggestion that his attack on Lord Brougham in the lobby of the House of Commons had to do with plagiarism. Conolly, op.cit., p.199.

The land board he proposed would discharge a dual function. It would both assist in the general deliberations of the governing council, and also, acting alone, transact all the affairs appertaining to waste land and its settlement. It would consist of five or more "real men of business, sent from England on salaries for service." Politically it would constitute half of the council of the federated British North American colonies, "doing duty in the council as advisers and legislators", cooperating with colleagues "to be chosen by the people eligible to sit in the Assembly." Further these five would

"form a land board, altogether independent of the Provincial Governors or Government, and be subservient, in that capacity, to a grand land-board at home. The grand national land-board, with its branches in several Provinces, might dispose of waste lands on strict business principles; and by a system, every way defined and adjusted, manage in the best possible manner for the public good. Accurate surveys and maps might be made and exhibited both at home and abroad, for the expediting of business, either in purchase or exchange." (1)

Elsewhere Gourlay's conception of a government for a free people transcends the crown colony second chamber here indicated. His idea of land and emigration commissioners is well in advance of the recommendation of the Select Committees on Emigration, 1826-'27. This will be remembered as bulking large in the system of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, and as based on the same assumption that the colonies would not "deny us the right of disposing of waste lands to the best advantage."⁽²⁾

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCXXXIX.

(2) Ibid. p.CCCXXXVI; Wakefield, "England and America", II, p.171.

Representatives of the board would be found in land offices at all convenient centres as in the American Republic, and so the long wearying journey to the authorities at York would be obviated. (1) They would have charge of the forwarding of immigrants and be in a position to afford authentic information. The idling at Quebec, so heavy a drain on scanty resources, as well as such a waste of valuable time, would be reduced to a minimum.

The settlers would comprise all classes. Heretofore colonization had tended to degrade mankind. It "is yet, I hope, to become the means of improving society, instead of lending aid to barbarism". (2) "The present system brings out only a part, and that the weakest part of society". The slow creeping progress of the backwoods settlement is itself calculated to encourage man's deterioration: his physical nature alone is stimulated, overstimulated, while his higher faculties, in isolation from the refining influence of civilisation, atrophy. Or worse, he sinks into easy-going ways, even physically. "Is it not possible to create such a tide of commerce as would bring with it not only part of society, but society complete, with all the strength and order and refinement which it has now attained in Britain----?" (3) Here is fore-shadowed, in particular, the Canterbury settlement, New Zealand, the possibilities of which, advertised by the colonial reformers, exercised such a compelling force over the minds of Tory Churchmen in 1848 - '49.

(1) Gourlay, I, p.378; Wakefield, "England and America", II, p.174, and passim, shows the same commendation of the American system. Cf. Geo. Stevenson's evidence before the Colonial Lands Committee, 1836. Acc. and Pap. XI, 512, p.14 et seq.

(2) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCXCV; II, p.393; Cf. Wakefield, "A Letter from Sydney", 1829, pp.148, 169.

(3) See next page.

In this connection fortunately Gourlay gives particulars. He knew but too well how severely the scarcities of 1816 - '17 had been felt by English farmers formerly in comfortable circumstances. Writing Earl Bathurst he quotes a friend in support of his view that "farmers with means will come" to the effect, that "more than half the farmers have been thrown out by the late bad harvests and will not require much persuasion to emigrate". The old argument destined still to a hundred odd years use against the emigration of men with money in their hands and purpose in their hearts, he met boldly, averring to the Colonial Secretary that "there is not a man who is desirous of quitting the country that it is not politic for government to aid in getting out of it; at least if he is willing to settle in a British colony"⁽¹⁾. Colonists such as the recent Perth settlers, whose circumstances he investigated, with capitals ranging from £30 to £300 could be looked for with confidence once the government had smoothed the way and inaugurated the movement. His contention found justification very shortly, particularly in the numbers and character of the voluntary emigration stimulated by government assistance of settlers on the much longer journey to New South Wales. For those - and he knew how many - quite without means to help themselves to a new land he had two suggestions. "Under the

(3) Cf. Wakefield, "A Letter from Sydney", p.137; "England and America", II, pp.176, 206, 217.

(1) Gourlay to Lord Bathurst, October 2, 1821, "Introduction" p.CCXCVI. Wakefield put the argument on a sound basis demonstrating what Gourlay merely stated, that capital in Britain was redundant just as population was.

wing of wealthy farmers many thousands of them might before now have been lodged in the province." ⁽¹⁾ While this may seem fanciful it must be remembered that it was a more or less common practice. Government recognised it, especially in the Australian colonies, undertaking to grant land in proportion to the labourers taken out by the grantee. Indentures, however, were too easily broken to justify promise of the continuance of the system: ⁽²⁾ Gourlay's "many thousands" is over-sanguine.

The second suggestion regarding the introduction of paupers is sounder. In a word, the able-bodied emigrant was to be taken out at government expense, and employed for two years on public works. The scheme had several obvious and unique advantages. First, there would in this case be no doubt about the assisted emigrant repaying the cost of his transportation. Second, while engaged on road-making or canal-digging, he would become acclimatised; he "would learn something of handling an axe; he would be free of all that gloom and awkwardness, which is so heart-rending to the old country people when they have to go directly into the woods after their first arrival in this country." ⁽³⁾ Third, by his labour the ci-devant recipient of parochial relief would create those prime essentials of well-conceived young colonies - good communications.

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCLXXXVIII; cf. p.CLXXXVIII. Note how definitely this practice was followed in the Swan River Settlement, the one feature of that unfortunate colony which Wakefield would praise.

(2) Wakefield, "A Letter from Sydney", pp.23, 24; "England and America", II, quotes Mr. McArthur to the effect that indentured servants could not be held to their bond.

(3) Gourlay, "Introduction", CCCLXXXIX. Cf. CXCI for his reprobation of such ill-regulated settlement as "places poor and destitute individuals in remote situations". This was one great (see next page)

The first project to which he would have five thousand labourers directed was the development of the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes navigation. (1) He drafts a schedule (2) - which again suggests those of the Emigration Reports - showing the cost of passage, labour and incidentals in connection with his canal schemes. It is a bare outline, a rough approximation, and like the more elaborate calculation regarding pauper passage repayments of the 1826-'27 Select Committees on Emigration, is unduly optimistic. The cost of transportation on the other hand is put too high. He reckoned it at £10 per/head. It is proof of his serious purpose that he made particular inquiries later in various British seaports, (3) and found that £7 would be more nearly correct. He would have five thousand workmen and their families taken out annually. They would be employed a second summer in each case. One quota only would be on the hands of the management over the winter. He was over-confident regarding the possibility of providing for the complement of workers discharged each December, even if it be allowed that their savings would amount to the figure he indicated. Gourlay's theory, like Wakefield's, provides labour for the colony, restricts the labour-

(3) (continued from previous page) error of Wilmot Horton's "Pauper Location".

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", see map facing page I.

(2) Ibid., p.CCCLXXXIX. See Appendix V, p.424.

(3) Ibid., p.CCCLXXXIX, foot-note, - Glasgow, Leith and Aberdeen, Spring 1820.

(4) £7 is the figure Wakefield uses, "Art of Colonization", p.228.

er to that status for a period of years, and puts first, as
 essential to steady, systematic progress, well-built communications ⁽¹⁾
 In navigation, the inland water-ways of the colony being improved
 in this fashion, Gourlay saw "a bond of connection between
 England and Canada". ⁽²⁾ Lord Durham for similar reasons suggested
 an intercolonial railway between the Maritime Provinces and
 the Canadas. How statesmanlike this latter proposal was,
 Confederation bears witness. Gourlay found an additional
 advantage in his proposal that not only would the train of
 commerce and communication bind the mother-country and colony,
 but that the joint preparation of the route would do so too.
 Britain was to supply money and hands: Canada security and homes.

Gourlay classified roads as of three grades - provincial,
 district and township. ⁽³⁾ The first or cardinal highways were to
 be provided by the colony as a whole. The last, being for purely
 local use, would be kept up by local funds. The expenses of roads
 of the intermediate grade would be shared by the colonial treasury
 and the communities affected by them. Gourlay seems to have
 grasped the idea of municipal institutions, so strongly and so
 wisely recommended in 1829. In his treatment of taxation he

(1) Gourlay attributed his appreciation of the prime necessity
 of good roads to his father's practice and precept. The latter
 had contributed materially to the introduction of the turnpike
 road into Fife. Cf. Rogers, "Memorials of the Scottish House of
 Gourlay", p.34; Gourlay, "Introduction", dedication; II, p.IV,
 gives his father's saying that "the first improvement of any
 country should be the making of good roads." For Wakefield's adop-
 tion of these principles see below chapter IX

(2) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCLXXVII.

(3) Ibid., p.CCCLXXXVII.

deprecates the assessment of town lots for state purposes, contending that such smaller sources of revenue are more judiciously left to the local authorities.

The heavy costs of canal construction in the St. Lawrence valley were not to fall on the Imperial exchequer. Gourlay proposed to have the scheme carried out on a business, not a philanthropic, basis. What was necessary was a thorough overhauling of colonial taxation, in combination with a competent, scientific handling of the wild lands of the colony. This done, colonial security would, he submitted, be found adequate by the British bankers.⁽¹⁾

In microscopic fashion he dissects the parasitic taxes fastened so unwisely on the necessities of life in the province. The tax on milch cows he holds up to contumely. He castigates this and kindred pettifogging devices to secure petty sums. He can explain them only as in unthinking imitation of Mr. Pitt's practice of "running into every corner to tax the middling and poorer classes of society".⁽²⁾

Instead of such miscellaneous taxes, he would collect "a general land tax, making no distinction whatever between wild and cultivated land, public or private property, that of residents or

(1) Gourlay and Wakefield prove this identically, by citing that superfluity of capital in the home-land which, as Gourlay puts it, enabled one banker to advance to France "the charges of the Allied Sovereigns for placing Louis XVIII on the throne". ("Introduction", p.CCCCLIII.); as Wakefield argued enabled Baring Brothers to advance funds to Louisiana, and many other such exploits of high finance. ("England and America", II, pp.107 - 109.)

(2) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCLXXXIV.

"absentees; the rule of estimating value to be governed by one
 "consideration, the rate of population in the township in which the
 "land is situated, taken in conjunction with that of the neighbour-
 "hood".⁽¹⁾ His principle that to a certain point, other things
 being equal, the value of wild land varies with the density of
 population, is sound. His method of applying it mechanically to
 determine the rate of taxation is less satisfactory. His illustra-
 tions suggest difficulties rather than dispel them. Nor can it be
 suggested in the sense in which he makes the assertion that "through-
 out the whole province nature has wonderfully equalised the value
 of land." That speculators in wild lands were escaping their fair
 share of provincial expenses was notorious.⁽²⁾ Gourlay touched the
 crux of the problem when he pointed to the extensive holdings of
 of the governing class, especially the legislative council.⁽³⁾
 Even holders of uncultivated tracts would benefit in the long run,
 he maintained, by the adoption of a uniform land tax.

"Land in America is the very lubber fiend which checks its own
 "improvement. Could nine-tenths of it be sunk in the sea, and after-
 "wards emerge by tenths, gradually, as it became absolutely
 "necessary for the wants of mankind, there would be infinite gain
 "in every way." ⁽⁴⁾

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", pp.CCCLXXI - CCCLXXII; cf. II, p.404. Here are two of Wakefield's major principles, the emigration fund, and the proportion between land and labour. See below p.342, note (3).

(2) Kingsford, op.cit., IX, p.219. Bill to tax unoccupied land moved in the Legislative Council by J.B.Robinson, rejected by 18 - 4. See Wakefield's quotation from the evidence of Mr. E.Ellice, M.P. (later Secretary at War) before the Committee of the House of Commons on the Civil Government of Canada, 1828, that "it was the fashion for every councillor or officer connected with government to get a grant of from 5,000 to 20,000 acres. "England and America", II, p. 247.

(3) Gourlay, "Introduction", pp.CCCLXXXIV - CCCLXIXV. a roughly approximate statement.

(4) Ibid., CCCLXXXV, cf. Wakefield, "Letter from Sydney", p.97 "What a blessing for the present race of Americans if the Pacific should overflow all the land that separates it from the Mississippi!"

£200,000 or £300,000 raised annually by taxation on his plan would do good even if thrown in the lake, "the effect being to force settlement and cultivation, by rendering wild lands less comparatively profitable to hold than cultivated land." How much more advantageous if such a sum could be used annually to bring labourers from Britain to create the public works so greatly needed! It was the security of the land tax that Gourlay proposed to offer the financiers of Britain, for the loan which was to effect the completion of the St. Lawrence canal system. He points out how readily financial backing could be obtained in Britain for dependable undertakings the world over. At the moment of writing "the funds are gorged", ⁽¹⁾ are in search of what Wakefield was to call "a new field of employment for capital." Gourlay argues that "the British Empire is a world within itself, and affords abundant "scope for transaction, - for exchange - for the accumulation "of wealth or the extinction of debt, by whatever name it may be ⁽²⁾ "called. All that we want is activity". In the war years money was poured out without stint; and though used unproductively ⁽³⁾ stimulated commerce to unusual activity. What is needed now in peace and depression is merely faith enough to advance a tithe of the war costs, on the security of colonial taxation to bring again "an excitement to industry", to "let the poor have work and a hope of independence and enjoyment".

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CLXXXVI.

(2) Ibid., pp.CLXXXIII - CLXXXIV.

(3) Ibid., p.CCCCVII.

The "general land tax" proposals are contained in a letter dated Niagara Jail, 7 June, 1819, addressed to the "Parliamentary Representatives of the People of Upper Canada".⁽¹⁾ The very fact that Gourlay could write of public affairs without undue resentment under the circumstances of unjust and arbitrary imprisonment speaks volumes for his sincerity of purpose. By a coincidence his article was printed in juxta-position with a report of the proceedings in the Imperial Parliament.⁽²⁾ The Irish pauper problem was then becoming acute. "Finding work for them in the bogs" was proposed and seconded by Sir John Newport and Mr. C. Grant respectively.⁽³⁾ Gourlay did not fail in publishing his second letter to contrast the two. Colonel Torrens had said that Britain needed "better soils to cultivate".⁽⁴⁾ Gourlay had shown that unequalled lands were available in Canada, yet work was being made for them in their native bogs!

In such passages as the foregoing - revised taxation, a British loan, labour transported to the colonies - Edward Gibbon Wakefield found the gist of his systematic colonization. On the

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", pp.CCCLXXVII - CCCXCI. "Niagara Spectator", June 10, 1819. The letter concludes: "Gentlemen, could I be assured that there was to be a speedy end to all illiberal and trifling proceedings how joyfully should I continue to write on this glorious theme". (the establishment of England's poor on Canada's fertile soil.)

(2) Of April 6, 1819.

(3) 14, June, 1819. Ibid, p.CCCXCIX. "Niagara Spectator", 17 June, 1819.

(4) Ibid., p.CCCLVIII.

security of wild land sales, funds would be raised to assist select-
ed emigrants. Without detracting unfairly from the worth of the
Wakefieldian system, it may be pointed out that the substitution
of land sale for land taxation, although essential to the
practicability of the scheme, is not in itself a very considerable
adaptation. Gourlay constantly asserts the success of sale of
wild lands in the States. One of his most discriminating reports
(1)
from the townships strongly recommends it. The similarity of the
circumstances of the Newgate student of colonial policy, and the
author of "Upper Canada" when these passages were written, must,
in itself, have given point to the suggestions Gourlay had for
Wakefield.

(1) Gourlay, I, pp.375-381, report of the township of Nichol.
"We have further to remark, that we think it would be of
"much benefit to the province, as also a relief to the mother
"country, were all the ungranted lands in the already surveyed
"townships sold at a moderate price per acre; when emigrants and
"others could select soil, situation, and neighbours, to their mind,
"for which they would far rather pay than go to the wilderness by
"lottery: the fund thereby raised could be well applied to the
"improvement of the internal navigation of the province and other
"public purposes, as also help to relieve many of the claimants
"who suffered losses during the late war."

Wakefield was later to make twenty-five excerpts from these town-
ship reports, - "England and America", Appendix, no.II, pp.296-302.
The care which he took to find in their 356 pages their illustra-
tions of his point, the increase in the value of wild lands due to
settlement, is in itself sufficient proof of his thorough familiar-
ity with Gourlay's volumes. The passage quoted herewith is one of
the very clearest recommendations of his main thesis - the sale
of wild lands rather than the free grant of wild lands, and could
hardly fail to influence him.

In yet another point of cardinal importance, Wakefield's land scheme grew from Gourlay's writings. The latter elaborated the basic idea of his general land tax thus:

"Land is valuable according to the degree of convenience attached to it; and other things being equal, increases in value as the density of population increases. A single family planted down on a square mile, as is the case in Upper Canada, can have no convenience - no sufficient strength to make head against the obstacles to improvement; and while the settler is held in misery, little value is added to the land he occupies. Plant down two families, twelve, twenty or more, on the same extent of ground, and each addition, up to a certain proportion, insures greater and greater comfort and convenience to the whole, while an instant and great value is given to the soil. One solitary family, settled on a square mile, must pine for years, become poor, dispirited, beggarly and brutal, while twenty families will not only retain their strength, their spirit, and their manners, but instantly flourish, feel contented, feel happy, and become more and more ambitious to excel in activity and skill". (1)

To attain this "certain proportion" of labourers to the appropriated land of the colony, Wakefield conceived his "sufficient price" per acre.

In the passage quoted above, and other such scattered through Gourlay's three volumes, Wakefield found the hint of "combinable labour". Here, too, is suggested the necessity of restricting the undue expansion of new settlements. Gourlay's references to the need of plan, of predetermined ends and means in colonization, are of the very essence of Wakefield's writings. (2)

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCLX. The under-lining is added

(2) Ibid., II, p.302, "Had ministers -----devised right plans for the disposal of wild lands -----"; "Introduction", p.CLXXXIV, "let proper plans be laid down"; cf. p.CCC. Cf. "England and America" II, Note XII, The Art of Colonization. This chapter, which constitutes 201 of 262 pages in the volume exclusive of appendices, (and a real importance much exceeding this disproportionate bulk) turns on a clear recognition of ends and means in colonization. Cf. pp. 61, 75, 109, 119.

From the application of system to the disposal of wild land Gourlay predicts, not only a diminution in the taxation it would be necessary to levy on the colonists, but an actual contribution to the exchequer of the empire therefrom. In both contentions Wakefield follows him. (1) In so far as colonization transcends emigration it will be shown that the difference Gourlay indicated was that which Wakefield stressed. Further, in the interval between the "Statistical Account of Upper Canada" and the "Letter from Sydney", the Emigration Committees of 1826 - '27 under the chairmanship of Mr. Wilmot Horton contributed to drive the difference home to the public of Great Britain.

Thus far Gourlay's land schemes only have been reviewed. His volumes on Upper Canada show a second, or political, aspect of the views of the colonial reformers in embryo to something like the same extent that his disposal of waste land suggestions do. Like his successors he is for a large measure of self-government. The Act of 1791, however, he found unnecessary at the time. At that early date, not a new constitution, but a renovated system of administration was needed. He regards the statute referred to which professed to establish the British Constitution in Canada as one of "sham liberality". (2) "Had ministers ---- chalked out certain rules to be observed by a governor and council---",

(1) For land tax (Wakefield uses rent-tax) see Gourlay, "Introduction", p. CCCLXXXVI; Wakefield, "Letter from Sydney", p. 196: for contribution to the British Exchequer, see Gourlay "Introduction" pp. XLIII, CXLVIII; Wakefield, "England and America", II, pp. 175, 243, note.

(2) Gourlay, II, p. 301.

providing, first, for "security for person and property", ⁽¹⁾ then "for the disposal of wild lands", "the provinces might have flourished far beyond what they have done". ⁽²⁾ While salaried business -men were putting matters right regarding immigration, settlement and public works, one amendment, only in the frame of government was necessary. "Judges and magistrates", appointed by the governor and council "should be subject to removal on the application of a certain large proportion, say four-fifths, of the people among whom they were to act." ⁽³⁾ Gourlay is doubtless influenced here by his own unfortunate experience: yet he has in mind not only the subservience of magistrates which he had witnessed, but the character and intelligence ⁽⁴⁾ of the class throughout the province. Where the selection of a justice of the peace was something of a gamble, and where it was necessary to curtail the power of the governor, he was impressed by the American practice.

Economic stimulation, he continued, had a political value which made it doubly important at this stage. He prescribed a brisk immigration. A British loan, on the security of the land-tax,

(1) John Mills Jackson, whose pamphlet has been cited, is quoted by Gourlay, II, p.318, as leaving the colony because of inadequate security. Gourlay even claims to have desisted from advocating emigration because he had discovered that "governors neither understood nor paid respect to the laws whereby property had value", "Introduction", p.CCCXV.

(2) Gourlay, II, p.402.

(3) Ibid., "Introduction", p.CCCXXXIX.

(4) Ibid., I, p.510.

disbursed in the province as wages of labourers engaged on public works would quickly excite local industry. It would increase the money in circulation and the demand for farm produce; shortly the supply of agricultural labour would improve, and the market for cleared lands quicken. For a time, while this vitalising current flowed into the very backwoods, the frame of government ⁽¹⁾ as it stood would serve. Improved administration should come first: efficient governmental departments should be created before constitutional change was effected.

He anticipated marked progress in the growth of the colony during that period which he described as being "at nurse"; an improvement in the mental state of Canadians as well as a quickening of their industry. He had occasion to commend a recent enactment of the colonial legislature making provision for education. He had urged popular education in England. The proposals, first of Whit-bread, and then of Brougham, he had heaped with encomiums. He cited the Upper Canadian act as suggesting what British legislation might aim at. He found the great body of the colonists sound at heart. With a forward-looking administration, and the stimulating influence of education they would shake off the lethargy into which a condition of economic stalemate had thrown them. He proposed as a minor contribution that twenty-five lads from provincial schools should be sent annually to British Universities. ⁽²⁾ This was but one step towards an

(1) Gourlay, II, p.305.

(2) Ibid., II, p.388. His appreciation of the imperial importance of such provision for the education of outstanding young colonists, should, of itself, preserve his name from utter oblivion. See pp.385 - 389. See similar recommendations, by Sydney Smith, Edinburgh Review, 32, July 1819; Gents.Mag. 1820, pt.I, p.35.



"enlarged and liberal connection between Canada and Britain", which seemed "to promise the happiest results for the cause of civilisation."⁽¹⁾

The opportunity for enlightened liberality on Britain's part would come in "ten or twelve years". Then the colonies should be "allowed to meet in Convention and choose a government for themselves". "Were a liberal system of government established in the colonies, liberal-minded men would spring up there; and thither liberal-minded men would emigrate from Britain."⁽²⁾ Their future loyalty need not be questioned. "It is their interest to remain forever connected with this country, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose that they would ever harbour a wish to throw off its sovereignty or deny us the right of disposing of waste lands to the best advantage." Gourlay had no hesitancy whatever regarding Canada's remaining true to her allegiance. The war of 1812 - 1814 had re-affirmed her fealty. Addressing the resident landowners, he wrote, "When we come from home we are not expatriated; our feelings as British subjects grow more warm with distance, and our greater experience teaches us the more to venerate the principles of our native land."⁽³⁾ There is no inconsistency as he sees it in proposing to retain control of the waste lands of a colony to which self-government was being given.

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CXCIII.

(2) Ibid., p.CCCXXXVI.

(3) Ibid., p.CXCII - CXCIII.

Administered as he intended these lands should be, colonies and mother country would profit mutually and to a maximum. The Colonial Reformers followed him in this somewhat puzzling conclusion. They followed him, too, in their first plans for Canadian re-organization, in postulating the advisability of confederation.

From Gourlay to Durham confederation and a full measure of local self-government seemed to offer the colonials a wide field of operations. Land administration was a technical matter, and, considering the area involved, one on such a scale as might easily exceed their capacity. Colonial administration in the various provinces had left so much to be desired in the past. The mother-country could apply a single, uniform system. From her midst the prospective colonists must come: she could best direct them to their new homes. The lands concerned lay on the periphery of settlement: were removed by distance - and the backwoods distances are long - from the colonial centres of population. (1) The settled districts could have but slight concern with wild lands questions. Their administration would on all counts be better in the hands of the imperial authorities, and would not be missed by the colonists occupied with the newer, nearer problems of self-government within the confederation.

(1) While this is generally true of Wakefield justice to him demands the recognition that he transcends this conception in parts of his work. He sees clearly that the best results will follow when incoming settlers fill the interstices in the new colony and old settlers remove, as they tend to do, to the frontiers of civilisation. Cf. "England and America", II, p.220.

On these grounds Gourlay had justified the seeming inconsistency had it occurred to him as such. But he was so far from seeing the retention of waste lands by the mother country as anomalous under free government that he insists that the American Question of the previous century had been susceptible of solution in similar fashion.⁽¹⁾ The picture of what might have been accomplished by a wise mother country with the proceeds of the sale of the Ohio Valley lands is followed by that of what may yet be achieved by such means.⁽²⁾ "Surely we may now be "taught by experience; surely in this more enlightened age, we "may learn how to turn to profit the immense territory we yet "possess on the continent of America! Let the eye only glance "over the map, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the "St. Lawrence to the Pole; and, then let me ask, if it may not be "for the honour of England, holding profit apart, to consider "by what means so vast a region may be tenanted with civilised "men - with happy souls and loyal subjects." Gourlay here approximates Wakefield's felicitous description of colonization as "the art of creating happy homes"; while the vision of the Canada-to-be exceeds in extent the bounds of the colony as envisaged by Durham.⁽³⁾ Not only does he suggest a scheme of Canadian Confederation but his intuition grasps something of the wider commonwealth of today.

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction, p.CCCXXXVI.

(2) For Shelburne's plan in this connection see above p. note

(3) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCCXIII.

The British North American colonies, Gourlay held, should be allowed the government of their choice, and be encouraged to confederate. He takes it for granted that the advantages of inter-provincial unity would be sufficiently self-evident to ensure confederation being brought about.

"They should hold congress in the month of June at Quebec. Lower Canada; Upper Canada; New Brunswick having Gaspé and Prince Edward's Island to it; Nova Scotia having Cape Breton laid to it; and Newfoundland, might constitute five independent, but confederated provinces. Labrador; East, South, West, and North Hudson, might fall into the confederacy as they became civilised and sufficiently populous" (1) ----- "The North American Provinces might choose three or more members each to attend Congress at Quebec; and one of these for each province, might be allowed to come home and have a seat in the British Parliament, with liberty to speak but not to vote." (2)

These member-delegates having made their annual visit to England could return in time for the June session of the colonial legislature at Quebec. "This a direct, social, lively, and watchful intelligence might be maintained between the home and colonial governments; all would be simple and efficacious; friendly and independent; active and harmonious." To strengthen these immaterial bonds, "these links light as air", material prosperity, flowing from the union of the complementary resources of mother country and colony, would contribute. British capital and British emigrants - not a "part of society but society complete with all the strength and order and refinement which is now attained in Britain" (3) - would enrich Canadian lands and Canadian life. Such a colonial policy would "eternally bind together Britain and her provinces by the most powerful sympathies of manners taste and affection." (4)

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCXXXVIII.

(2) Ibid., pp.CCCXLII - CCCXLIII.

(3) Ibid., p.CXCII.

(4) Ibid., p. CXCII.

With the same sketchiness with which, inspite of his numerous pages, he treated emigration schemes, Gourlay exhibited "a mere skeleton of provincial government." Two details only are filled in: both are suggestive - a Prince as viceroy, and a supreme court superseding appeal to the King-in-Council.⁽¹⁾ Regarding the general policy of colonial self-government and imperial land control he found an opportunity for experiment in Newfoundland. That island was at the moment petitioning for a "free and regular constitution of government". Though the soil there was, "in general, unfavourable to cultivation" large tracts were better and would serve to show the advantages of "a judicious mode of laying out and disposing" of wild lands. The attempt would explode the "absurd, antiquated notion" that even the cultivation of potato patches by the inhabitants injured the fisheries. The experience gained in Newfoundland of free government by the colonists, and of systematic settlement by the mother country, would afford a definite basis on which to establish the continental provinces.

That a change in Britain's colonial policy generally is imperative is the note on which, in conclusion, he rings the changes. "Colonial governors are, all of them, armed with too much power." "They are blinded by the sycophants who surround them." "Bickerings between provincial assemblies and their governors are now continually heard of." The reaction on the prosperity of the settlements is disastrous. Colonists are kept "spiritless and poverty-stricken." "As consumers of British manufactures they are

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCXLIII.

not half so advantageous to us as any like number of people in the United States." Ministers find their ends in "holding colonies for the portioning of their friends and relations." The opposition is "for abandonning Canada or selling it to the United States. This is worse and worse. I can answer for the loyalty of the Canadians: it abounds; and their desire to be independent of the United States is strong from one end of the country to the other. All that they want to continue and ensure this forever is the promise of independence now, and the reality after a given period of years." What Gourlay means by independence seems to be very much like the freedom within limits which Durham proposed: it is not separation; it is set definitely in opposition to abandonment or sale.⁽¹⁾ His last word stresses the family relationship which, of the figures pressed into service since his day, best connotes the present bond of union. "How glorious for Britain to enjoy the immortal honour of being the first nation on earth to do justice to her progeny - the first⁽²⁾ truly entitled to the endearing appellation of PARENT STATE! "

Gourlay's influence on Wakefield regarding both the disposal of wild land and the emancipation of the colonist from the vagaries of an arbitrary, long-range despotism has been developed in some detail. The same influence might be shown even in the comparatively minor field of the illustrations and the language with which

(1) In an interesting comment on the long excerpt from Rochefoucault's "Travels", referred to above p.230, he says, "We need not 'speedily change the colonial form of government'; but there are changes which cannot be too speedily affected, to retain 'a bright jewel in the British Crown'."

(2) Gourlay, "Introduction", pp to CCCL.

these principles are established. For although the Englishman much excelled the Scot in the felicity of his exposition, especially so in "The Letter from Sydney", even that strikingly realistic, at times almost lyrical, serial from the columns of the 'Morning Chronicle' shows what looks very much like borrowings from the less able writer. Gourlay hesitates whether to describe settlement as an "art" or as a "science"; Wakefield, stating that since there is more to be done than to be learned, decides the question for the use of "art". Constantly the former uses the phrase "a grand system of emigration": "scientific colonizers" and "systematic colonization" becomes the language of the Wakefieldian school. Gourlay's use of "a certain proportion" between families and the land which supports them passes over to Wakefield. The comparison of the following passages is interesting in this connection:

"As to establishing hereditary nobility in Canada, it is a thousand pities, that Mr. Pitt's notion had not been carried into effect. Nothing could have so well exposed the absurdity, as actual trial and consequent ridicule. By this day we should have witnessed many a pleasant farce. We should have seen, perhaps, the Duke of Ontario leading a cart of hay, my Lord Erie pitching, and Sir Peter Superior making a rick; or perhaps his Grace might now have been figuring as a petty-fogging lawyer, his Lordship as a pedlar and, Sir Knight, as a poor parson, starving on 5,000 acres of clergy reserves." (1)

"If the (South Australian Land) company should revive their project, they would so well to put a House of Lords into it; with a Baron Blackswan, a Viscount Kangaroo, a Marquis of Morrumbidgee and a Bishop of Ornithoryncus." (2)

(1) Gourlay, II, p.296.

(2) Wakefield, "England and America", II, Appendix, No.III, p.338, note no.(45).

The re-appearance of what might be called Gourlay's blunders in the works of his successor is, perhaps more conclusive evidence as to the use Wakefield made of "Upper Canada" than his agreement with Gourlay's better founded suggestions, or similarities in the expression given to them. Particular reference might be made to the acceptance by both of the fallacy that a free colonial government would acquiesce in the control of a lucrative department of essentially local interest, such as the land-granting bureau, remaining with the mother country. Each might be right independently of the other; but that they should also be wrong in the same respects requires too much of credulity. Bentham and Paley, Darwin and Wallace illustrate the former proposition; but, universally, a school boy is called in question who shows up not only a fair portion of his class-mate's good work, but also a number of his errors.

Gourlay's claim that Wakefield acknowledged his indebtedness to him has been referred to above. ⁽¹⁾ By 1843 the success of the new System of Colonization associated with the name of Edward Gibbon Wakefield was such as might have tempted Gourlay to the invention of an interview otherwise circumstantial enough. There is other testimony *to consider*. That Gourlay was known to the family of Wakefield strengthens the likelihood that the ^{latter} knew his writings ⁽²⁾ on Canada also. Wakefield's three years of enforced leisure in Newgate gave him ample opportunity to read all that had been recently published on colonial conditions and administration.

[1] Page 217.

(2) See above page 218.

How actively he devoted himself to that study is witnessed by the success with which he imposed his imaginary New South Wales letters on the London public. That he knew Gourlay's work he himself confesses. Of its autobiographical discursiveness he writes, "it becomes difficult to extract from his book those parts which are merely useful".⁽¹⁾ There can remain, however, very little doubt as to how fully he succeeded. Gourlay's writings are tangled and repetitious, but they contained most of the ideas which Wakefield afterwards advocated. In "England and America", Wakefield gives twenty-five excerpts from the reports Gourlay had received from the townships to which his queries were sent.⁽²⁾ In this connection he acknowledges his indebtedness. It is evident, however, that the assistance he found in the prolix volumes of his predecessor was much more vital and fundamental than such proof of the tendency of real property values to increase as settlement thickens. It is agreed that Wakefield's most original tenet is that of a **sufficient** price for wild land.⁽³⁾ In concluding the argument regarding Gourlay's contribution, it might be permitted to repeat concerning this major recommendation of Wakefield's, that his forerunner not only advocated the sale of Canadian lands on the American plan, but

(1) Letter from P--- to Lord Howick, "Spectator", No.III, January 8, 1831.

(2) II, p.296. The quotations constitute answers to query no. 28, regarding the price of wild land. They are carefully made and described as from "Gourlay's 'Historical (sic) Account of Upper Canada, vol.I, page 269, et seq.'" "

(3) R.C.Mills, op.cit., p.139.

contended that Nature had wonderfully equalised their value throughout the province, and quoted experienced settlers as favouring the introduction of a uniform price for unappropriated land.

In the extract quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Gourlay deplored his failure to implement his vast design. It was a project beyond the accomplishment of any reformer who acted as he did entirely without committees, an association, a party behind him. His ideas were ahead of his day. ⁽¹⁾ The unrestrained, often tactless utterance he gave to them invited opposition which, in that day, needed no solicitation to combine against innovation. Such was the uniform consequence, from the unguarded advocacy of parliamentary reform which compelled the resignation of his Captaincy in the Pitlessie Volunteer Corps, ⁽²⁾ of poor law reform which necessitated his withdrawal from the Bath Agricultural Society, ⁽³⁾ of colonial reform which resulted in Upper Canada in repeated arrests, unjustifiable imprisonment and, finally, summary banishment. He believed in publicity; but the rashness and imprudence of his methods robbed even his most promising efforts, of success. His township queries made a new and unique stir. Had he been possessed of cautious prudence that attempt might have been carried through to a constructive end. He should

(1) Conally, op.cit., p.199

(2) Ibid.,

(3) His pamphlet "The Right to Church Property Secured" added its clerical members to the landowners already his foes; his exposé of their complicity in instigating the Corn Bill compelled the course which ended in his ostracism, II, pp.XVI - XVIII.

(1)
not be confused with reformers of the physical force school.
He denied the assertion in "Vindiciae Gallicae" that real improvement is to be attained only by revolution. He believed in reform through Parliament, whether the end sought was the improved condition of the poor and provision for their education, or the limitation of an over-weening executive in the colonies and rules for the disposal of wild land. His pamphlets were showered broad-cast. Systematic petitioning he advocated and practiced. (2)

A convention of delegates he held to be the ideal method of ascertaining as well as developing public opinion, and of ensuring the removal of grievances. He would have opposed the Corn Bill of 1815 in a farmers' convention of the previous winter could he have got it together. (3) He did succeed in convening a representative gathering of Canadian farmer delegates. His advice to them, thinking that the will of the people had been made sufficiently clear by their assembly and discussion, was moderation itself.

His actual accomplishment, after his return to Great Britain, was seemingly as complete a failure as it had been in the "benighted

(1) That he knew Cobbett was one of the reasons for his banishment from Canada. He had no political associates in Britain. He would secure reform "by peaceful, orderly, and manly measures." "Introduction", p.CCCLXVI.

(2) "Twelve years have gone by since my mind was made up as to the mode by which the people should proceed to obtain any great national end. It was, and is, by systematic petitioning ---" "Introduction" p.CXXXVI. "Shortly before my departure for Canada, I had a second petition presented to the House of Commons, to record what was further required for the relief of the poor from oppression; and to give them practice in the only peaceable mode of proceeding for that end," p.CXXXVIII.

(3) Ibid., p.CCXXV.

(1)

province" of Upper Canada. His petitions were still-born. Mr. Scarlett M.P. made use of his pamphlet, "Tyranny of the Poor Law Exemplified", in supporting his Poor-Relief bill introduced May 8,

(2)

1820. Gourlay's attack on Brougham in the lobby of the House of Commons has never been satisfactorily explained. The writer of the sketch biography - a sufficiently brief and inadequate affair -

(3)

knew the eccentric agitator personally. He states that the cause of this onslaught was Brougham's plagiarism. There are indications in Gourlay's works which show a sensitiveness regarding the offence which might be construed as giving colour to the explanation. It is not, however, incompatible with his character, as it is self-revealed, to believe that the impulse which resulted in the lobby scene was a desire for quick notoriety, and for immediate fame of a kind. He had a towering egotism. He believed that he could save the poor of England and that no one else could. Was he Quixote or madman? Flashes of inspiration abound in his "Upper Canada": but such could constitute a beacon only to the experienced navigator. Edward Gibbon Wakefield had the knowledge which enabled him to profit by such guidance. Himself an unknown man, and one whose even more erratic conduct had created all-unnecessary difficulties, he lacked the grace to acknowledge what he

(1) They were indefinitely numerous. That dated June 16, 1821 recites three earlier which were actually presented; the first and second as indicated above p.220, the third by Sir James Mackintosh on July 11, 1820; the fourth also seems to have been entrusted to the successor of Romilly. "Introduction", p.CCLXXXII. (Continued over page.)

(2) Ibid., pp.CCIX-CCX, "My little tract, which, six years before, had been presented to 700 Peers and Commoners of Parliament and obtained for me thanks only from two". (Lord King and Francis Horner M.P.) Cf. p.CXVI f.

(3) See above p.217 note (2); 236 note (2).

owed to such another. In one passage in the "Letter from Sydney" he takes comfort from the thought of Abbe Raynal, "Madmen sometimes utter words of profound meaning." The wonder is whether the Newgate student of colonial policy really had himself in mind, or him to whom he was so much indebted, Robert Fleming Gourlay.

(1) continued - re Gourlay's petitions.

On November 27, 1826, Mr. Hume presents another petition which states that the petitioner had his suit urged before "every session of the last parliament". Now he asks for a Select Committee to examine them. Hansard, N.S. XVI, 142.

C H A P T E R VIII.

WILMOT HORTON AND THE EMIGRATION COMMITTEES.

"October 22 - Mr. Wilmot Horton, Under Secretary of State, also breakfasted. He is full of some new plan of relieving the poor's-rate by encouraging emigration. But John Bull will think this savours of Botany Bay. The attempt to look the poor's-rates in the face is certainly meritorious." -Sir Walter Scott. (1)

"That which was formerly a matter of remote knowledge and concern - that which even twenty or thirty years ago was regarded only as a means of getting rid of the off-scourings of our population - has now become, on the contrary, a matter of close and domestic interest to many of the most intelligent and many of the best conditioned (2) and most respected families in this country." -W.E.Gladstone, 1855.

It was through R. J. Wilmot Horton, Under Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, that the British public came to realise that the colonies offered both the nation and the individual a hope of relief from the combined ills of the post-war years. Although his ideas concerning emigration were regarded as altogether unsound and impracticable by Wakefield, it will be shown that he served to attract such attention to the subject in the third decade of the century as materially to assist the propaganda of the latter in the fourth. He constitutes a link between Gourlay and Wakefield.

In the fifth edition of his essay (1817) Malthus had written:

"If, for instance, from a combination of external and internal causes, a very great stimulus should be given to the population of a country for ten or twelve years together, and it should then comparatively cease, it is clear that labour will continue flowing into the market with almost undiminished rapidity, while the means of employing and paying it have been essentially contracted. It is

(1) "The Journal of Sir Walter Scott", ed. D.Douglas, 2vols. 1890, I, pp.280, 281, October 22, 1826.

(2) Address to the Members of the Mechanics' Institute, Chester, 12 Nov., 1855. Pamphlet under the caption "Our Colonies."

"precisely under these circumstances that emigration is most useful as a temporary relief; and it is in these circumstances that Great Britain finds herself placed at present." (1)

(2)

Malthus dominated the situation. The facts fitted his theory just as perfectly as the passage quoted fitted the facts. War, work offered by expanding industry, and the guarantee of parish-supplied subsistence had put a premium on population. Numbers still increased; with the discharge of soldiers and sailors the seeming increase was even greater than the real. Emigration gradually assumed another appearance. It promised to rid the state of its redundant population.

Yet the government adopted no consistent policy towards it. In 1816, and 1817, officers and men of the forces were located by Colonel Cockburn at the public expense in the township of Drummondville in Lower Canada, and in various townships on the right bank of the Ottawa River. For a time civilian emigrants were granted free passages and tools. It was found that advantage was being taken of this offer by emigrants whose object was to reach the United States. (3) Then a deposit of £16 for each adult transported was required, the sum to be repaid by government after two years, provided the settlers had complied with the conditions. The cost of transporting others was regarded as a loan which they were to begin to repay after ten years. (4) Vaccillation was the

(1) Malthus, op.cit., II, pp. 61, 62.

(2) For opposition to the contention that there was a redundancy in population, a surplus which might therefore be emigrated, see below p. 313.

(3) See Edinburgh Review, 37, June 1822, p.251. Gourlay quotes the contemporary newspaper press to the effect that a £10 bounty which had been given for a time to emigrants was abruptly withdrawn. "Introduction", p.CCCI. (See next page, (3) continued) (Appdx.F.no.1)

(4) E.g. Lanark Settlers of 1820-21: Acc.&Pap.1828 XXI,p.369 &

order of the day. Private enterprise accomplished something. Lord Selkirk settled Highlanders in the Red River valley, and Colonel Talbot⁽¹⁾ established more-immediately successful settlements on the north shore of Lake Erie. It was not until 1820 that the government indulged in a substantial experiment in state-aided emigration. This was the Albany project. The original grant was £50,000.⁽²⁾ Some 3,659 emigrants were conveyed to and established in Eastern Cape Colony. Although ten times their number applied for passages no systematic selection was made of those accepted. Many of them proved quite unadaptable to colonial conditions.⁽³⁾ The inevitable misadventures of the early years necessitated further government assistance until four times the first sum voted for the expenses of the colony had been expended. The Grahamstown settlement eventually flourished, but when Wilmot Horton became Under Secretary neither its condition nor the expenses of its founding were calculated to encourage other such attempts at relieving the pressure of over-population by emigration at the charge of the national exchequer.

(1) Described by Horton as "in his own person the most remarkable promoter of colonization probably now existing". "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", Introductory Series, 1830, p.24; see "Five Years' Residence in the Canadas", 1824, pp.104, 105, by Edward Allen Talbot.

(2) The Quarterly Review, 22, July 1819, maintains that it was obtained with ease and might easily have been more. Gent's Mag. 1819 pt.II, p.484, would have more voted, and not confined to the Cape.

(3) For the composition of the party see Quarterly Review, July 1821, p.461. It included musical instrument makers.

(3) (cont'd. from p.266) "The Colonial Policy of Great Britain" anon., 1816, recommends a strong emigration programme (pp.170, 138, 224), care being taken to place settlers strategically (p.39), would encourage the blending of the North American Indians with the English by intermarriage (p.60), objects to deposit of £16 required by government as a guarantee of two years' residence (p.137 ff.).

Public opinion as reflected in the periodical literature in the years immediately preceding the emigration reports seems to have been extremely uncertain with regard to the worth of colonies and dependencies. The contradictions which appear in consecutive numbers of the leading journals make it hard to evaluate their general attitude. The Quarterly Review is fairly consistent in its advocacy of the retention of the colonial empire and in the encouragement of an active emigration policy. It wavers in its attitude to the general thesis of Malthus. ⁽¹⁾ It is interestingly and uniformly opposed to colonial agitation for fuller self-government. W.E. Wentworth's book on New South Wales protested that "the country possessed neither council, assembly, nor trial ⁽²⁾ by jury." The reviewer is strongly opposed to such concessions as the "stripling Australian", "ingenious in constitution-mongering", demands. Although a Committee of the House of Commons did recommend a council to assist the Governor, Lord Bathurst gave conclusive reasons against such a course - the obvious "difficulty of selecting proper persons." Dr. Whately's reference to Gourlay's agitation

(1) In April 1816 on the ground that increasing wealth always meant increasing need for charity, Malthus is pooh-poohed. (Quarterly Review, 15, p.234). In July 1817, reviewing the fifth edition of his essay, the critic holds it easier to disbelieve than to refute his theory; finds a double value in it, (a) that it shows the danger of "interfering with the wages of labour", (b) that it furnishes a general argument against "all sweeping reformers"; and concludes by regretting that his masterly hand, which first showed that "equality, plenty and community of goods were unattainable to beings constituted like mankind, had not also proceeded to show that they were no less undesirable". (ibid, 17, pp.369-403.)

(2) "A Statistical, Political and Historical Description of New South Wales", 1819, reviewed Quarterly Review, 24, October 1820 pp.55 - 72.

for reform in Upper Canada which appeared in the preceding issue of the Quarterly was of the same order. ⁽¹⁾ He rejoiced that that self-styled "political projector" found that the Canadians had something better to do than "to set about new modelling the constitution." Dealing five years later with the third edition of Wentworth's publication his reference to the legislative council which had been granted in the meantime is quoted - "a wretched mongrel substitute for a legislative assembly." The reviewer is still strong for arbitrary good government. He hopes the ministry will not readily be prevailed upon to constitute assemblies which are "calculated from their very nature to obstruct and paralyze their own measures -----."

"A Governor, assisted by an independent council, but authorized to act on his own responsibility according to the model of India, is, we are persuaded, better adapted to secure the peace and prosperity of the colonies, than any legislative assembly that Mr. Wentworth and his associates can devise for them." (2)

The reference to India is suggestive of the general attitude of the Quarterly. It is illuminating in this connection to find that such a quotation as the following had been made but a short time before;

"Let us therefore calmly proceed in a course of gradual improvement; and when our rule ceases, for cease it must, (though probably at a remote period) as the natural consequence of our success in the diffusion of knowledge, we shall as a nation have the proud boast that we have preferred the civilisation to the continued subjection of India." (3)

(1) Quarterly Review, 23, July 1820, p.400. Article ascribed to R. Whately D.D., Archbishop of Dublin on the authority of the Dictionary of National Biography.

(2) Quarterly Review, 32, June 1825, p.314, reviewing "A Statistical Account of the British Settlements in Australasia", 2 vols 3rd. Ed. 1824.

(3) Major-General Sir John Malcolm, "A Memoir of Central India" 1823, p.304, quoted Quarterly Review, 29, July 1823, p.414. Enjoining (see next page)

If British officers governing in British North America and Australasia had been as considerate of the feelings of the governed as Major-General Sir John Malcolm here quoted was of the feelings of the Rajputs, paternalism had been robbed of most of its objectionable features. The approval of the Quarterly Review of such a policy of conciliation in India, is in keeping with its conciliatory attitude towards the colonies. It feared, but not to the extent of the acquiescence of the fatalist, their eventual loss. An article in July 1817, "Spain and her Colonies" had given rise to the confession that there is, perhaps, "no problem in politics more difficult than the treatment of colonies"-

"To watch and nurse their youth, and to mark the hour of their maturity; - to know on what occasions to enforce, and when to relax the strictness of paternal superintendence - when to require unconditional obedience, and how to yield to supplication and remonstrance". (1)

The writer's conclusion is that Spain had better profit by Britain's experience and conciliate her colonies. The influence on British thought of the defection of the Spanish colonies has been referred to; this article makes the comparison definite. The pessimistic conclusion, however, is not drawn in its extreme form. Kindly tact may be trusted, this review consistently holds, to keep the remaining colonies loyal for an indefinite period. The conduct of the Canadians, French as well as English, in the American War of 1812 - 14 is ground for gratification. Archbishop Whately argues that in

(3) (continued from previous page) passivity on junior officers in India, Sir John Malcolm said, "nor must we remove the smallest stone till another is ready, fitted to fill the niche." p.407.

(1) Quarterly Review, July 1817, p. 532.

another war, should such a misfortune occur, Canada will have an equally good chance of defending herself - or even a better chance - in that 10,000 face 50,000 better than 10 face 50. Increase in numbers on both sides of the Great Lakes will progressively improve her position. Although the Archbishop is not willing to aver that Canada will be British ad infinitum (he asks what is certain to that extreme in time), he insists that to act as though the colony was certain to be lost is the best way to lose it. ⁽¹⁾

He cites the case of a doctor who is sure his patient will die.

He argues,

"Every motive of policy, as well as of honour, concurs in recommending that Canada should with the utmost diligence, be "cherished and fortified". He asks, "Where else shall we find so strong a barrier to the boundless increase of that power which threatens to prove the most formidable rival that Great Britain has ever encountered?"

He recommends exhibitions to British colleges for colonial students for holy orders. Equally imperative is the need of full information concerning the colony. He endorses the policy of emigration with arguments which were to become very familiar through Wilmot Horton's use of them. That it will pay to send deserving poor to Canada even at a cost greater than that of keeping them at home. It would not deplete the national resources because too few would be content to go. In support he quotes Malthus. British capital would thereby be transferred to Canada, but better there than to

(1) Quarterly Review, 23, July 1820, p.391. On this point "Observations upon the Importance of the North American Colonies to Great Britain" by an old inhabitant of British America (Mr. Haliburton), 1825, is of particular significance. Similarly regarding the amelioration of the lot of the slaves in the West Indies, the Quarterly Review, 30, January 1824, p.566, maintains that it is impolitic to assume that the planters are "incapable of acting better

the United States where it is going. Besides emigration creates a market. The impolicy of "founding a great empire for the sole purpose of raising up a people of customers" (Malthus) is admitted. But as Wakefield was to contend, Dr. Whately a decade earlier asserts, the capital which emigration schemes would require is capital which is lying idle; it could not therefore be described as being withdrawn from the national stock.

This article, on the whole, presents an attractive view of the inducements British North America held out to prospective emigrants. In similar reviews New South Wales, Van Dieman's Land, and especially the Cape of Good Hope are described as deserving of attention. (1) The Quarterly Review addresses its considerations in this vein "to such of our countrymen as possess the true feelings of Englishmen, but are nevertheless compelled to carry that name to foreign lands," in the hope of directing emigration to the colonies and away from America. The United States and its inhabitants were still in the bad graces of the journal. (2) In its policy of colonial conciliation only one criticism of over-kindness on the part of government has been met with in these columns during these years - that is its strictures on allowing the use of

(1) As early as 1819 governmental direction of emigration was urged. One argument was that "ship after ship was disgorging on our shores loads of disappointed emigrants". Quarterly Review, 22, July 1819, p. 204. In 1824 the facts elicited regarding the unfortunate "Poyais" settlers, Mosquito Coast, Honduras, by McGregor v. Thwaites and Another, powerfully strengthened the case for official guidance. It remained for the Emigration Committees to recommend effectively. Barnwall and Cresswell's Reports, (1824-'25), III, pp. 24 -37.

(2) The Gent's Mag. 1824, pt. II, p. 432, joins heartily in the prayers of Matthews, the comedian "that nothing may ever separate England from America but the broad billows of the Atlantic."

French in Lower Canada. One passage complains, "our subjects of Canada are as much French at this day as when we conquered the country".⁽¹⁾ In this criticism the Edinburgh Review concurs.⁽²⁾

Opinion as expressed in this latter publication in the years between Waterloo and the 1826 - '27 emigration reports is indeed a shifting quantity. Pride in the empire mingles strangely with willingness to see it dismembered; now emigrants should be directed to the colonies, again it is immaterial where they go; finally the most generous use of national funds without claim for repayment is strongly endorsed that Britain may be rid of her surplus, especially of Irish paupers.

The tendency to glory in extensive empire prompts such passages as the following:

"At this moment, there are few of the systems of legislation, either of ancient or modern times, which are not in force as living law within the British empire. Menu and Mohammed decide the civil rights of the Hindoo and the Mogul; and an appeal from India compels our Privy Councillors to consult the Koran and the Puranas, as authorities at Whitehall. Justinian is obeyed by the courts of the Ionian Republic. In the Norman Isles, the severed portions of the domains of the Conqueror, the barbaric customal framed by his Justiciars, still guides the Grand Bailiff and the Seneschal, who dispense the equity of Rollo, now forgotten in the hall of Rouen. Canada cherishes the volumes which have been cast forth from the Palace of Justice; and the legitimate representatives of the proud and learned Presidents of the Parliament of Paris, are found in the court-house of a colonial town." "Our sovereign appoints his Alcades and his Corregidores in the Indies of Columbus; while his Landrosts in Southern Africa are guided by the Placets of the States-General of the departed Republic of the Netherlands. The laws of King Christian of Denmark are administered by British authority in the torrid zone. And the Deemsters assembled on the Tynwald of Man, have not abandoned the polity of the Sea-Kings of Scandinavia." (3)

(1) Quarterly Review, 25, July 1821, p.463. Cf. *ibid.*, 22, July 1819, p.240.

(2) Edinburgh Review, 24, November 1814, p.260

(3) See next page.

The reviewer finds it difficult to question the policy which first induced England to soothe her stranger subjects, by thus indulging them "with the exercise of their own laws". His function as a critic of administration is more easily discharged with regard to the present. It is now time that government began to "assimilate the institutions of the dependencies to those of the mother-country". The general introduction of trial by jury is the first step to be taken.

During these years the Colonial Office is subjected to some discriminating criticism by the Edinburgh Review. Wakefield was by no means the first to expose its bureaucracy, incompetence and corruption. An article on Botany Bay attributed to Sydney Smith pointed out departmental deficiencies with fairness and with candour. (1) He holds that the colony must be possessed of some unique advantages to have prospered under "the system of neglect and oppression experienced from the mother-country, and the series of ignorant and absurd governors that have been selected." The colonists have flourished "in spite of Colonial Secretaries

(3)(continued from previous page.)

Edinburgh Review, 36, February, 1822, pp.287, 288. Cf. the attitude to colonial retrenchment of the Gentleman's Magazine, 1823, pt.I, p.447-8. "If the scale of 1792 is to be the standard then it can only be attained by reducing England to the scale of 1792. Is England willing to give up Malta, St. Helena, Mauritius, Surinam, Trinidad, Berbice, Essequibo, St. Lucie, Tobago, the African settlements and our East India conquests? Then her naval and military establishments can be reduced." This is a propos of "Opinions as to the real State of the Nation" by the Ghost of the Marquis of Londonderry. It is described as a "luminous pamphlet".

(1) Edinburgh Review, 32, July 1819. The authorship is assigned to the Canon of St. Pauls on the authority of William Parr Greswell, "The Growth and Administration of the British Colonies, 1837-1897", 1898, p.15.

expressly paid to watch over their affairs." (1) They have flourished in spite of a foolish multiplicity of settlements, another instance of a major objection of Wakefield's anticipated. Yet in extenuation of the remissness of the department the critic is constrained to admit that it is seriously over-worked. "There should be two or three Secretaries instead of one." The appointment of governors is reverted to again and again. At such a distance jobbery in their selection, it is urged, surely might be dispensed with. Governor Bligh's preferment is cited adversely in this connection. An edict of a later governor (2) establishing rates of wages is attacked on conventional economic grounds. The reviewer half seriously insists that prospective governors should undergo "an examination on the principles of Adam Smith and (hold) a license from Mr. Ricardo." The stricture on Governor Macquarrie's proclamation manifests in one of the best informed Englishmen of his day the universal tendency to judge of colonial conditions on the basis of home experience. The imagination which saw the environs of Sydney from Newgate, as Wakefield did, was all too lacking among his contemporaries. This temperamental deficiency

(1) The abuses connected with convictism occasions the bitter comment, "while Earl Bathurst is full of jokes and joy, public morals are thus sapped at their foundation". *Edinburgh Review*, 38, February 1823, p.104. Again the "Traveller", November 17, 1821, attacks the stagnation in Upper Canada which accompanies the free gift of land as compared with the activity which is the attendant of its sale in the United States. "That there is mismanagement the mere results show", quoted in Gourlay, "Introduction", CCCXXVIII.

(2) Governor Macquarrie, December 7, 1816. Cf. W.E. Wentworth op.cit., (1819) pp.105 - 106.

accounts for much. Its consequences range from the momentous to the ridiculous. It is not too extravagant to ascribe the loss of the First Empire, in part, to a lack of imagination. It is certainly the want of such a faculty that discouraged emigration on the ground that in the new settlements of the western world emigrants were compelled to clean their own shoes. (1)

The attitude to emigration of this journal is at first that of rather doubtful acquiescence. The question comes up time and again in connection with successive volumes of travel in America, and with it the inevitable comparisons between the United States and Britain. Political leanings constantly show through. (2) America is defended against "excesses of obloquy" less, it seems, out of sincere regard for her institutions than from the desire to oppose the scathing criticism of the Quarterly Review. The Edinburgh journal points out that it is the party "hostile to popular rights" which views American emigration "with paroxysms of spite and jealousy." Those who are reluctant to confess the progress of the United States are accustomed to sneer "at every thing beyond the Atlantic except the Province of Canada, which the most judicious authorities represent upon all occasions as the very right arm of British strength"(sic). This invasion of the field of colonial policy by the animosities of domestic

(1) Such was an objection of one who returned disappointed from the settlement of the Birkbecks and Flowers on the Ohio. Gentleman's Magazine, 1823, pt.II, p.547.

(2) The phrases quoted is not an exaggeration when used of of such articles as that on the Cruise in the Pacific of Captain David Porter, U.S. Frigate "Essex", Quarterly Review, 13, July 1815 pp.352 - 384.

partisanship seriously detracts from the value of its views especially relating to Canada. Extolled by the Tories, perforce it must be depreciated by the Whigs. When the political aspects of the case are in abeyance the journal in blue and buff is prepared to admit that Canada's ultimate prosperity is tolerably certain; that, after some years of hardship, the emigrant may finally attain to a secure independence; that the advantages to be derived from emigration are not altogether chimerical, but guarantee at least the earnest of increasing comforts. (1)

And, again, when faction does not intervene, the same journal is prepared to give straight advice to "Jonathan" to avoid superlatives until in the plenitude of freedom he produces a single great man to compare with Britain's hundreds in all departments. (2)

That the real attitude of the Edinburgh Review towards America was not materially different from that of all moderate Britons is suggestively indicated in a criticism of the administration for not favouring a policy of colonization in British India. "Who would be base enough", asks the reviewer of James Mill's 'History of British India', "not to wish to see another America arise at a distance which might relieve us of the fear of its rivalry?" (3)

(1) Edinburgh Review, 37, June 1822.

(2) Ibid., 33, January 1820, pp.78, 80.

(3) Edinburgh Review, 31, December 1818, p.412. Fear of American rivalry and anxiety for Canada alike were mitigated by the certainty that the unwieldy republic would inevitably be sundered by domestic schism. "It is scarcely conceivable that ---- the dwellers on the Columbia should have common interests with the navigators of the Hudson and the Delaware", *ibid.*, 31, Dec.1818, p.149.

Although it conceded that Canada would eventually prosper, the Edinburgh Review was inclined to think that it would be as a free people, or as an adjunct to the near-by republic. (1) Emigration (2) was allowable because it could not hurt Britain-so few would go. The sea was like death, was the literal death of a life's associations. Again, it was an undertaking "that none but the (3) most enterprising would venture upon, when urged by adversity." A propos of the recent encouragement government had held out to pauper emigration (Wilmot Horton's experiemnt of 1823) it remarks "Surely no one can be so silly as to suppose that even a fourth (4) part of those who emigrate to Canada have any intention of "remaining there."

As in the preceding period, that which follows the peace sees an approximation to common thought on colonial policy in connection with the slave trade. Of the standard periodicals the Quarterly is again, and consistently, the more concerned that coercion of the (5) colonial legislatures should be avoided. Their difficulties, it

(1) The loyalty of Canadians is more than once referred to as doubtful. E.g. Edinburgh Review, 37, June 1822, p.250; as in 1814, see above p.199 note (2).

(2) Ibid., 39, January 1824, p.341. The basis of much of the comment on emigration at this time is obviously Malthus' chapter on the subject as writtne in 1817 and reprinted in the 1826 edition, II, bk.III, chap.IV. He retails the hardships of emigration as presented in Burke's "European Settlements in America", e.g. II, p.219, and in Collin's "Account of the English Colony of New South Wales". His view prevails that, "If the wages of labour in any country be such as to enable the lower classes of people to live with tolerable comfort, we may be quite sure that they will not emigrate; and if they be not such, it is cruelty and injustice to detain them." II, p.60. On such grounds this Edinburgh Review article approves the removal of legislative trammels on emigration. Cf. the following citation note (3)

(3) Ibid., 1818, 30. (4) Ibid., 39, January 1824, p.343.

(5) Quarterly Review, 33, March 1826.

maintains, are underestimated. The Edinburgh Review categorically insists that "if they persist in delaying and in trifling with the (1) "declared sense of the Legislature, the work must be done for them." It was in April 1797 that Mr. C.Ellis, at the instigation of the West India Committee, carried an address to His Majesty which it was hoped would lead to such local legislation on behalf of the negroes in the British Islands as would eventually prove more efficacious even than the abolition of the slave trade. Twenty-seven years later, reviewing the Eighteenth Report of the Directors of the African Institution, the northern quarterly with quite comprehensible exasperation records "that nothing whatever has been (2) done" by the planter legislatures. The martyrdom of the Reverend John Smith, condemned to death by a court martial in Demerara, had added fuel to the national indignation. The reviewer touches the question of the relationship between every colony and the Imperial Parliament when he claims that

"the right to legislate for the internal concerns of the colonies, "is beyond a doubt clearly in the mother country. Even with respect to the North American colonies, the right was never abandoned, "except only as to taxation; and that was given up, not as a matter of right, but upon the express ground that it was inexpedient to "exercise it. The 18 GeoIII c.12 merely declares that Parliament "will not impose duties upon the colonies excepting for the regulation of commerce; and in departing from the right of taxing, all "other legislation is distinctly reserved." (3)

(1) Edinburgh Review, 41, October 1824, p.213. Cf. "Threats are much objected to by the Islands, and justly-----. But there is a difference between a threat and a warning - a vain braggart menace and a fair, open, timely notice. The duty of the Imperial Legislature is to act as the rights of its colonial subjects, and the safety of the state demand; and to discharge its own functions for the common good, if the Colonial Assemblies forget or abandon theirs". Ibid, 26, June 1827, p.213.

(2) Ibid., 41, p.223. (3) Ibid., 41, p.214. Sydney Smith in the Botany Bay article alluded to above, Edin. Review, 32, July 1819, p.21 had cited the assumption by government of the right to tax the New South Wales colonists. He states that after being taken up in parliament by the opposition the practice was discontinued. For complaints of the breach of the act of 18 GeoIII in Canada see above p.226 and Gourlay, II, p.318,319.

The folly of leaving British enactments aimed at the amelioration of the lot of the slave to the colonial legislatures carries the reviewer on to argue for the appointment to official positions in the slave-owning islands of those only — straight from the mother-land if necessary — who have no connection whatever with the planters' pecuniary interests. Though the cost of civil administration in the colonies is often a subject of complaint, it is light-heartedly to be added to, by assuming the payment of the salaries of such appointees, that the law may be enforced in the negroes' interests.

In so far as Britons were divided into two camps on the general questions of colonial policy, the line of severance is well drawn by J.R. McCulloch's exhaustive article in the Edinburgh Review of August 1825 on the one hand, and by the answer it elicited in the Quarterly Review of the following March on the other. Huskisson's speeches in support of his act of that year relaxing the restrictions of the mercantile system afforded the opportunity for the Edinburgh Review's entering at length upon an examination of the principles of the colonial system. McCulloch's strokes are the broad unquestioning ones of a self-confident artist. His division of the subject is simply (1) supposed advantages of the system and (2) positive disadvantages. (3) Among the former, advantages to the

(1) Edinburgh Review, 42, pp.272 -303.

(2) Quarterly Review, 33, March 1826, p.410, ff.

(3) He has clearly in mind a Quarterly Review article, 22, January 1822, pp. 522 - 540.

mother country are classed. They should be discounted to the extent that they involve disadvantages to the colonies; for the empire is a unit. Again, following Adam Smith, the artificial attraction which a monopoly constitutes is really hurtful. A colonial trade is no safer than any other: "the comparative cheapness of our manufactured goods" is the one and only security for trade. Foreign countries may refuse to buy, but never to sell. Finally and fifth, Ricardo has demonstrated Adam Smith's error; there is no increase of profit to be found as the result of restricting the trade of the colonies to the mother country. The positive disadvantages are found in the "reciprocity of injuries" to which the mercantile system amounts. ⁽¹⁾ He quotes the Army Extraordinaries ⁽²⁾ for 1821 to show that military expenses in time of peace in the West Indies and British North America alone

(1) E.g. the duty on Canadian timber has ruined the Baltic trade while "every man of sense, whether in the cabinet or out of it, knows that Canada must at no distant period be merged in the American Republic." Edinburgh Review, 42, p.291.

(2) "Abstract of the actual Disbursements of the several Commissioners upon Foreign Stations, charged in the Army Extraordinaries for the Year ending 25 December 1821, and paid by Great Britain, exclusive of the Revenues collected in the several colonies and other Expenses voted in the Army and Ordnance Estimates for that Year :-

1. Canada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	£397,629	14	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
2. Nova Scotia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	105,586	2	4
3. Newfoundland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,285	10	7 $\frac{3}{4}$
4. Bermuda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28,193	6	7 $\frac{1}{4}$
5. Bahama Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,808	13	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
6. Windward and Leeward Islands & Colonies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	321,480	8	10 $\frac{3}{4}$
7. Jamaica	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114,818	15	6

£989,802 12 2 "

Edinburgh Review, 42, p.292. What the Army Extraordinaries included besides bona fide military expenses Sir Henry Parnell was to demonstrate in 1828. See Sir John Sinclair's strictures above p.193.

(1)
 approximated £1,000,000 annually. The excessive cost of sugar to the British consumer would of itself, he maintains, justify the adoption of absolute free trade; that it should be introduced gradually is the one concession the West Indians deserve. The necessity of protection for British shipping interests on the score of national security he dismisses cavalierly. A slightly larger naval rating in time of peace would obviate any danger on that score, and the evils of the press gang into the bargain. But his great argument for the abandonment of the last vestiges of the mercantile system he finds in the recent legislative concessions in navigation introduced by Robinson and Huskisson. Since Britain has been deprived of practically all her monopoly of colonial goods, the colonies should no longer be favoured in British ports. To conclude he denies that he considers "the foundation of colonial establishments as, generally speaking, inexpedient." On the contrary Europe has benefitted incalculably by the settlement of America. He even concedes that "occasions frequently occur, in which governments may advantageously interfere to settle emigrants in foreign countries," and to support and protect them until they can stand alone. From this point the Edinburgh Review could with sufficient consistency lend its countenance to the schemes of Wilmot Horton.

(1) And Sheffield op.cit., p.293, to the effect that the naval defence of the West Indies in the American War "cost Britain a larger sum than would purchase the fee-simple of these islands."

(1)

The rejoinder of the Quarterly to this proud challenge to defend the worth of the colonial system lacked the daring comprehensiveness of McCulloch's article. It scores its points none the less, beginning with a reference to the champion of absolute imperial laissez-faire as "an itinerant professor of Political Economy" lately come down from Scotland "to teach our senators wisdom." If no colony is to be retained save such as leave a net profit over their actual cost in £.s.d. what is to be said of Gibraltar, the Cape, New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land? All the West India islands, it is asserted, support their internal governments out of internal taxation, and Jamaica pays for its defence. Did Talleyrand, the crafty Ulysses of his time, urge France to give up her colonies? To refute the argument of the "northern sages" 'reductio ad absurdum' give Ireland to Charles X and Scotland to Charles XIV. Statistics are given to show that the Baltic trade is not succumbing to the Canadian lumber preference. The loyalty of Canada, it is submitted, has stood the test both of battle and of blandishment. McCulloch's statement that "the navy of Great Britain might be as formidable as it now is ---- though we had not a single merchant ship", suggests to the Quarterly reviewer that the dogmatic economist "had been hoaxed by a jocular old admiral."

(1) McCulloch wrote, "We defy anyone to point out a single benefit, of any sort whatever, derived by us from the possession of Canada, and our other colonies in North America" Ibid., p.29. The Morning Chronicle, November 17, 1821, had asserted, "We gain nothing by Upper Canada; the inhabitants pay no taxes; an immediate sum of money is raised by taxation from the people of this country, and spent in that province."

On the question of the retention of the colonies Robert Gourlay excerpts some expressions of opinion of interest. He also notes that "our Opposition men run to another extreme. They are for abandonning Canada, or selling it to the United States."⁽¹⁾

From Bell's London Messenger he quotes:

"It always has been our opinion, and we know it personally to be that of one of the greatest statesmen this country ever produced, that Halifax, Canada, &c. are not worth what they would eventually cost England; and the true point of wisdom would be to make the best bargain we could for them to the United States." (2)

While opinion during the decade following 1815 was active regarding the colonies, it was still, as in the days of the old empire, badly informed.⁽³⁾ What knowledge many had regarding colonial conditions was deplorably out of date,⁽⁴⁾ It has been shown that Burke's mid-eighteenth century work was the standard authority of Malthus. Adam Smith's "man is of all luggage the most difficult to be transported" was rhyme and reason for acceding to emigration: it was a reassurance that few would go, as late as 1818. Until this date the Niger was held to debouch with the Congo, and the waters of the rivers Murray and Darling to traverse

(1) Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CCCXLV.

(2) Ibid., p.CCCXLVI. This and a similar excerpt from the Edinburgh Review of August 1817 elicit from a "Quebec Gazette" of February 1818 the confident assertion that the "sale proposition can have few partisans among the people of England."

(3) The Quebec Gazette cited in the note above finds that "with respect to America, it (the Edinburgh Review) often shews a want of information which could hardly be expected in a work of such acknowledged merit."

(4) See above p.192.

the entire continent of Australia. The need of more accurate
 information finds frequent expression. (1) Periodicals demand more
 careful, more practical observation on the part of travellers. (2)
 The effort to bridge the gap between Britons at home and abroad
 was beginning to be made. (3) It was indeed high time. The social
 status of colonists was yet, in the mind of too many who were
 influential, but little above the caste of the pariah. Botany
 Bay, as a quotation at the head of this chapter indicates, was on
 too many lips. (4) Sir Walter Scott glorified what was distant in
 time: a novelist to glorify in the same fashion the out-posts of
 empire, what was distant merely in space, was sorely needed. In

(1) See Dr. Whately's insistence on this point, above p.271. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1820, pt.I, p.35, demands an accurate set of maps of the Cape. Again, re colonies generally, *ibid.*, 1824, pt.I, p.7. Mr. Bright M.P. on February 15, 1827, speaking to Horton's motion for the reappointment of the 1826 Emigration Committee, described Canada as "one of the bulwarks of the Empire." He would support a vote of £50,000 for maps and surveys to secure a more practical handling of the question. *Hansard*, N.S. XVI, 495.

(2) E.g. the *Quarterly Review* would have had the Reverend John Campbell, the author of "Travel in South Africa", see with the eyes, for example, of a carpenter, 13, July 1815, p.309. It rejoices when it can present "a recent and authentic picture", as it does in 23, May 1820, p.74, of "the fertile and healthy island of Van Diemen's Land."

(3) Writing in 1821, Gourlay cited and reviewed some seven books dealing with Canada and the United States which had appeared since his project of a "Statistical Account of Upper Canada" was announced. ("Introduction", p.CCCI ff.) Publications regarding the Birkbeck settlement in Illinois became a little literature in themselves. Cobbett's trenchant criticisms of these works (*Political Register*, XXIX, pp.981-1000), Gourlay maintains, especially his phrase "Fearon's Falsehoods", were instrumental in stemming the tide of emigration to America. The departures to the United States fell off one-third following 1819. H.B.Fearon, "A Narrative of a Journey of Five Thousand Miles through the Eastern and Western States of America, etc". Cf. *Edinburgh Review*, Dec. 1818, vol.31, pp.138-250. Morris Birkbeck, "Notes on a Journey in America", 2nd.ed. London, 1818.

(4) Cf. Lamb's "Distant Correspondents", (*Essays of Elia*, *World's Classics* ed. p.150) Of "B.F.Esq., at Sydney, N.S.W.", he inquires, "What is your staple trade, - exclusive of the national profession, I mean?"

Charles Lamb's sense there were still too many "Imperfect Sympathies". Writing to Sydney was too much "like writing for posterity." It seems a little forced to maintain that the spiritual hiatus between mother country and colony could be filled, even to a slight extent, by a controversy over the sordid facts of a surplus of paupers in the one and an excess of untenanted waste in the other. But such is the healing influence of knowledge which leads to a common understanding. The blue-books of Horton's era, ⁽¹⁾ though he came to see that like Walpole's Excise Bill those entitled Emigration Reports were unfortunately named, in the end, contributed to the establishment of innumerable living links of sympathy between the prolific land-hungry metropolis, and the settlement-awaiting provinces, of empire.

Robert John Wilmot entered Parliament in 1818 for Newcastle-under-Lyme. His family connections were such as, joined to some ability, advanced him to the Under-Secretaryship of State for War and the Colonies in 1821. ⁽²⁾ Two years later he added his wife's name, Horton. When Canning became leader of the government ⁽³⁾ Horton's promotion was looked for. He resigned office in July 1828 rather than serve under Wellington. He was knighted before proceeding to Ceylon as governor. After seven years service, he

(1) Horton claims that "Blue Books" date from the Colonial Secretaryship of Lord Bathurst. Cf. his "Exposition and Defence of Earl Bathurst's Administration of the Affairs of Canada, 1822 - 1827", 1838, p.40.

(2) The author of the Greville "Memoirs" describes ^{Horton's} Mechanics' Institute lectures as displaying zeal but without method to unintelligibility. 1st. series, 1874, II, p.97. Nor was Sir James Stephen flattering, "Address on the British Colonies and Colonization", 1858, p.7. Spencer Walpole records that "His deficiencies as a speaker were compensated by administrative abilities which he was known to possess" "A History of England", 1890, III, p.325.

(3) Colchester Diaries, (1861) III, p.486.

returned to England, and to renewed activity as a publicist in
 (1)
 the interests of pauper emigration.

As early as his second year in office his scheme for state-aid to able-bodied paupers desirous of emigrating to British North America was printed and won the approval of Ricardo. And this, says Horton, "although my estimate (of the cost of transportation) was then far beyond what it is now necessary to take." (2)
 The economist, though but a slight acquaintance and a political opponent, approved heartily. He wrote:

"The plan would be economical; it would enable us to get rid of the most objectionable part of the Poor-laws, the relieving of able-bodied men; and what is to me by far the most important consideration, it would not fail to make the wages of labour more adequate to the support of the labourer and his family besides giving them that as wages, which is now given to him as charity." (3)

The Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland, 1823, examined Horton's project and approved of it. Emigration promised to lead to tranquillity, and that to the introduction of
 (4)
 British capital. In this year Lord Liverpool's administration

(1) His book, "Ireland and Canada", 1839 was one of his last works, He died in 1841.

(2) "The Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", Introductory Series 1830 with which are bound "An Inquiry into the Causes and Remedies of Pauperism, Series 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1830. Ricardo to Horton, January 19, 1823. Introductory series, pp.19, 20, note. It was probably this first estimate (printed though not published) which E.A.Talbot, op.cit., described as extravagantly high.

(3) In similar vein Francis Horner had written Gourlay, May 27, 1815, acknowledging a copy of the petition on behalf of the Poor of Wily Parish, Wilts, "that one of the worst consequences of this factitious condition of things was the modern practice among our English farmers, of paying part of the wages of labour out of the poor's rates." Gourlay, "Introduction", p.CXXXIII.

(4) "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", pp.7, 8.

authorised a colonization experiment on these principles. Peter Robinson, a Canadian, whose zeal ⁽¹⁾ in the undertaking seems to have equalled his knowledge of the backwoods of Upper Canada, was appointed to superintend the selection, transportation and ⁽²⁾ settlement of 568 Irish paupers.

These emigrants were established on the Mississippi River, a ⁽³⁾ tributary of the Ottawa. At £22. 1s. 6d. per head they were transferred from Cork and settled with rations for one year, farming implements, and stock. The journals of the day were not slow to criticise the expenses of the experiment as excessive. It was shown that in 1821 some 1883 emigrants from Lanarkshire were carried to Quebec with statutory provisions on the voyage at a cost of £2. 18s. each, as compared with some £10. 10s, for ⁽⁴⁾ the ocean passage only of Horton's settlers. No repayment of ⁽⁵⁾ the cost of transportation was required. After five years an

(1) See the commendation of the Emigration Committee of 1827, Acc. and Pap. 1826 + '27, V, 550, p.32.

(2) 186 men, 143 women, with young persons, Acc. and Pap. 1826 IV, p.312.

(3) District of Bathurst. See the testimony of H.J. Boulton, Attorney-General of Upper Canada before the 1826 Committee, March 20 Acc. and Pap. 1826, IV, p.319.

(4) Edinburgh Review, 45, December 1826, p.60. The total bill for the state experiment of 1823 was £12,539, for the voyage £5,872.

(5) These 1823 and 1825 attempts were experiments purely and simply. The Emigration Committees worked out various schemes of repayment by the settler. Later Horton reverted to the idea that it was inadvisable to demand such a return of the cost of passage and settlement. See his reasons, "An Inquiry into the Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", 2nd. Series, p.15.

annual quit rent of two pence was to be paid. The enthusiastic Under-Secretary regarded the project as a success. Robinson and he were examined by the 1824 Committee on the State of Ireland, and convinced them of its satisfactory character in so far as that could be determined at that time.⁽¹⁾

A second grant for experimental emigration was voted in 1825. It was £30,000. Robinson was again in charge of the party. The difficulties of selection were greatly increased by the very number of the applicants for passages. 2024 were selected; an authentic statement adds that nearly 50,000 had to be refused. The abstract of applications for assisted emigration attached to the first and final reports of the Emigration Committees of 1826 and 1827 respectively more than establishes the probability of this estimate. The settlers were located in the vicinity of their predecessors on the same terms, at an appreciably reduced cost to national funds.⁽²⁾

The interest the experiments had aroused, still more the increasing need of some generous attempt to cope with the evils of overcrowding and unemployment, especially in Ireland, called for a thorough examination of the possibilities of emigration. The financial crisis of 1825 had greatly aggravated distress in Great Britain itself. On March 14, 1826 Horton moved for a select

(1) Appendix no. 11 of the First Emigration Report gives the finding of this committee, Acc. and Pap. 1826, IV, p.312.

(2) At an average of £20 for each adult; Hansard, N.S. XIV, 1360 seq.

(1)

committee on the expediency of encouraging emigration. His argument was weakest with regard to the measures to be taken to prevent the "vacuum" caused by the abstraction of emigrants being filled again. Hume agreed that a committee would do good: it would never countenance such expense. Give a poor man £100 (what it would cost to settle a family of five) and "he would establish himself as comfortably in Ireland as elsewhere". He contended that McCulloch had told the Committee of 1825 that 100,000 removed from Ireland would be but "a drop in the ocean". The motion was carried.

The Emigration Committee of 1826 found a redundancy of population "in extensive districts in Ireland, and in certain districts in England and Scotland." 'Redundancy' is defined as being, not an absolute over-population, but an excess relative to employment offered - a redundancy of "able-bodied active labourers with their families, for whose labour there was no effective demand." No system of emigration could be recommended which was not essentially voluntary and was not calculated to remove able-bodied paupers. The evidence elicited made clear the large unappropriated areas in British North America, the Cape of Good Hope, New South Wales, and Van Diemen's Land. Advantages to be expected from regulated emigration were, a widened market for British manufactured goods, an increased supply of raw produce, and a diminished call on the taxpayer in the mother country for the costs of colonial defence following from the greater capacity

(1) Hansard, N.S. XIV, 1360 seq.

of the colonials to defend themselves. No field for emigration was considered other than the British colonies. The need for efforts, legislative and practical, to prevent the vacuum occasioned by emigration from filling too quickly was alluded to. The Sub-letting Act of 1825, and the private interests of the landlords once freed from the incubus of a tenantry three or four deep, might safely be trusted to secure that end. It was pointed out that where a commodity such as labour ⁽¹⁾ was over-supplied to the market, the withdrawal of a relatively small portion of the supply would effect a disproportionate improvement in the demand. The report concluded with the following words :

"Your Committee beg finally to express their decided conviction, that the circulation of their Report, and of the minutes of evidence, throughout the United Kingdom and the Colonies, will enable any future Committee to resume the subject, with the means of proposing measures sufficiently definite to justify their recommendation of them to the House for its adoption." (2)

An article in the Edinburgh Review following immediately on the presentation of this report must have contributed widely to its publicity. ⁽³⁾ The writer sees a grave danger to Great Britain from

(1) The point being that unlike other merchandise labour could not be stored for future disposal.

(2) Acc. and Pap. 1826, IV, 404, pp.1 - 382. It had something of the desired effect. Mr. Wilson, an Irish landed proprietor, assured the 1827 committee that before the publication of the report of the previous year not one in a hundred of his peers had regarded the emigration of their tenants as a practical, money-saving proposition. Acc. and Pap. 1826-7, V, 550, pp.4, 5 note, and queries nos. 3069 and 3070. In this connection the argument of the Edinburgh Review, 44, September 1826, p.261, that parliamentary debates are more influential than the press in forming public opinion is of interest.

(3) Thomas Bryce Esq. to Horton, February 22, 1827 writes, "I had been much struck with the article on the subject of emigration in the last Edinburgh Review, to which, as comprising much practical knowledge and useful details, I endeavoured to direct the attention of my friends". "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", p.100.

the alarming pauper conditions prevailing in Ireland. "Pauperism like water will find its level."⁽¹⁾ It cannot be heaped up in Leinster or Ulster. Already from a quarter to a third of the labourers in the west of Scotland and England were Irish. The steam packet, in Sir Henry Parnell's phrases, had become "a floating bridge". A mere toll of fourpence or sixpence secured the destitute Irish labourer the right to cross the intervening water. Self-preservation required^{that} another bias be given to this tide of humanity. Assisted emigration should be very extensive, one seventh of the population, 1,000,000 perhaps should be enabled to migrate. The cost is estimated at approximately fourteen millions. It is maintained that the need is so great as to justify such an outlay. A decisive objection is entered to colonization at home;⁽²⁾ the waste places of Britain would be found waste. Such utterly untrained folk could not be provided for permanently in that manner. Money or credit given them would inevitably be misapplied. To think of employing such numbers on government works the reviewer considers utter nonsense. Nor does he approve of the

(1) Edinburgh Review, 45, December 1826, p.54.

(2) Michael Thomas Sadler was the chief exponent of this method of poor relief, "being convinced that the best colonies we could plant, with respect to the agriculture and manufactures of England, were those which might be established on the uncultivated wastes of our European Empire." Hansard, 1829, N.S. XXI, 1729. Cf. Bennet, *ibid*, 1826, XVI, 298; the suggestions re "Poor Colonies" such as those at Frederick's-Oord, Holland, in the *Quarterly Review*, 43, May 1830, pp.252-255, article attributed to Mr. Powlett Scrope by Wakefield, "England and America", II, p.186 note.

proposal to deal with emigration by means of money loaned by government or the parish to the pauper. The attempt to collect it after the elapse of the suggested seven years would be likely to drive the struggling pioneer to the United States or to rebellion. Nor is the voluntary contribution of landlords towards the cost of passages a sound basis on which to proceed. Such sums would clearly be inadequate. The reviewer recommends, since Ireland profits immediately by the removal of her destitute, that a tax, say 5% of his rent-roll, should be levied on each individual landlord. In the same forthright, somewhat heartless fashion it is urged that seventeen-year-olds should be prevented from marrying by a ruthless demolition of vacated cottages. In brief, emigration, at once and extensive, state-aided, and continuous for a decade, is heartily endorsed,

The subject of emigration was much debated during the 1826-27 session of Parliament. Petitions for assistance to emigrate were numerous. Even Hume was stirred to suggest government action. (1) He confessed that he knew that tens of thousands were intensely interested. Opposition to the general proposition took the form of criticism of the cost involved, and of the suggestion of alternatives. Benett was for the cultivation of waste lands within the British Isles; at any rate for the discussion of the Corn Laws before emigration. Lambie contended that Ireland needed good government and Catholic Emancipation more than the removal

(1) Hansard, N.S., XVI, 298, December 5, 1826.

of her inhabitants. Peel, at that time Home Secretary, took a somewhat neutral attitude deprecating the raising of false hopes among thousands, maintaining that the difficulties of establishing them in the colonies were being minimised, commending Colonel Cockburn's evidence denying the capacity and willingness of the assisted emigrant to repay the money advanced to establish him. Horton was able to reply that Colonel Cockburn had been shown letters from groups of the 1823 and 1825 emigrants, forwarded by the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, so convincing regarding their progress that he had recanted his doubts. Further the Under Secretary for the Colonies had received from McCulloch, the economist whose views had been stated in the House as severely critical of the Emigration Committee's plan, answers to a series of some thirty questions perfectly in keeping with the principles of the Committee. Horton submitted that the report in question had thrown "great light on many circumstances not understood with respect to the colonies."⁽¹⁾ The fertility of the areas of settlement, the comparatively certain future of the colonist "firmly fixed on the soil", the tolerable comfort and peace of mind with which he could set out for Upper Canada, above all the need for relief from the poor rate burden argued for action of this order. He drew attention to the striking situation of the parish of Shipley in Sussex, where the total rental was £2,599 and the total poor rate £2,314. Among supporters of emigration as a way out

(1) Hansard, 1826, N.S. XVI, 476. February 15, 1827.

for this state were Colonel Torrens, and Messrs. Bright and Baring. The former urged that, in Britain at that time, not only labour but capital, also, might be described as redundant; that consequently extensive state-assisted emigration was calculated to be doubly profitable, affording a new field of employment for both men and money.⁽¹⁾ Bright was for more practical handling of the question. Mere expense should not prevent necessary action. He had great praise for the Quebec Emigration Society. It has been noted that he described Canada as "one of the bulwarks of the Empire."⁽²⁾ Baring spoke as one who knew from personal knowledge of the hard work and substantial comfort the settler could confidently anticipate in British North America. He was less certain that it would be wise to count on repayments, even after seven years. The motion to continue the investigation of the question by select committee was carried. It resulted in a practical reappointment of the earlier committee,⁽³⁾ with Horton again in the chair.⁽⁴⁾ A member of the House commented that "emigration was the hobby of the honourable gentleman opposite" (Horton). The taunt had its truth. The enthusiasm the Under Secretary displayed, the knowledge he gained of the subject, his indefatigable perseverance, were such as characterise the pursuit of hobbies.

(1) Hansard, 1826, N.S. XVI 492.

(2) And recommended generous allowance for maps and surveys. See above page 285, note (1)

(3) Hansard, 1826, N.S., XVI, 512. A list of the 1827 committee is given in "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", p.11.

(4) James Grattan, M.P. Hansard, 1826, N.S. XVI, 490.

Meanwhile the Colonial Office had commissioned Lieutenant-Colonel Cockburn to make a thorough investigation of the facilities available in British North America for extensive colonization.⁽¹⁾ In addition he was to find and have surveyed 300,000 acres of good land, adjacent to settlements for the reception of some 10,000 emigrants to go forward in the autumn. He was enjoined to make tentative arrangements for provisions and tools at the point of embarkation, along the route and on the selected site. A line of communication between the sea and the future settlement was to be cleared, since "the prosperity of emigrants must be so dependent of the state of the roads in their immediate vicinity." He was to have prepared and forwarded accurate maps indicating all possible topographical features such as mill sites. Data as to population, labour, costs, and land values were to be compiled. "Every description of information" necessary to ensure judicious steps towards continued emigration was to be brought back. At the same time the Commissioner was cautioned that the service on which he was employed was of preliminary, not definitive character. He was to be economical, and to avoid as far as possible commitments that were final.

Unfortunately Colonel Cockburn's detailed encouraging presentation of the colonial situation was not available for the second Emigration Committee. That body made an interim report within a week of its first sitting. It felt constrained to protest against the idea becoming widely current that selected persons were to be transported and located "exclusively at the Public Expense". It affirmed by resolution that it did not recede

(1) His instructions are in Acc. and Pap. 1828, XXI, 109, dated Jan. 26, 1827, signed R.W.Horton.

from the position of the former Committee "that private or local contribution in some shape ought to form the basis of any system of emigration."⁽¹⁾

A second special statement was made six weeks later recommending exceptional action at once to alleviate distress among the hand-loom weavers, especially of Lancashire.⁽²⁾ The Manufacturers' Relief Committee had offered £25,000. If the government would vote £50,000, from six thousand to seven thousand particularly deserving destitute English could be emigrated. These weavers, with commendable independence, had clung to their two or three acre plots of ground in spite of grinding poor rates, and notwithstanding the fall in the price of farm produce, and the almost total denial of employment for their looms occasioned by the growth of mechanical processes. The Committee's emergency plea on their behalf argued "that their partly agricultural habits render them more eligible for the particular kind of relief contemplated." In the weaving trade the abstraction of a comparatively small number of unemployed might confidently be expected to result in a large measure of relief to the craft as a whole. The emigration proposed was several times larger than any yet undertaken; it was to be from England where the willingness to emigrate was not as widespread as in Scotland and Ireland.⁽³⁾ The Colonial Office had advised that preparations were being made in the North American colonies for

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1826-7, V, 88, 26 February, 1827.

(2) Ibid., Sessional Paper number 237.

(3) It was a common-place that there were Scots and Irish only in Upper Canada because there were no poor rates at home to support them. See No. 3891, p. 381, Acc. and Pap., 1826-7, V, 550.

the possible reception of such numbers. The main argument
 (1)
 remained humanitarian.

The final report presented extended to 41 pages with evidence and appendix of 658 more. The Chairman thought it but justice to state "that the opinions of many of the Members of this Committee who were originally hostile to emigration, were entirely reconciled to its expediency by the evidence which they received."
 (2)
 The definitive report was adopted unanimously. It is of interest to consider that so representative a group as the Committee constituted concurred in endorsing a policy which paid such tribute though implicitly to the British North American colonies. It will be urged that doubtless members of the Committee agreed in its findings, knowing, as not a few of the supporters of the early Home Rule Bills are said to have known, that their proposal would be rejected "in another place". The protest must be conceded. The educative value of the investigation for the members of Parliament concerned, and for the public at large, remained. The third decade of the century witnessed a wide unobtrusive adjustment of the mind of the British populace to the colonies, as yet having positive worth. The indications are that to this end the Emigration Committees contributed to no small degree.

(1) Industrial conditions improved so materially before the end of the year that there were no applications from this district for such assistance. Peel pointed this out in the House the next year. Hansard, 1828, N.S., XIX, 1518. Malthus had indicated that there would always be more or less oscillation between an overstocked and an understocked labour market. 1826 ed. II, p.61.

(2) "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", pp.11, 12.

The Third Report "confirmed and supported conclusively" the principles laid down by the previous Committee. It believed that such "confirmation without exception" could not fail to impress the House. (1) "The permanent deterioration of the condition of the English and Scotch labourer" must result unless "the irruption of the pauper population of Ireland" is checked. Ireland has decided on emigration; it is for the legislature to decide whether Great Britain or British North America is to receive the emigrants.

"The question whether an extensive plan of emigration shall or shall not be adopted, appears the your Committee to resolve itself into this simple point; whether the wheat-fed population of Great Britain shall or shall not be supplanted by the potato-fed population of Ireland." (2)

An exodus of Irish is necessary to facilitate the change in the management of estates, the discontinuance of the pernicious system of sub-tenantry. "A judicious system of Emigration", essential to England's own welfare, is calculated to make Ireland "a very rich and prosperous country."

The relief of able-bodied paupers was having such a deleterious effect that one witness feared that if work continues to be made for them, "we shall no longer get an Englishman's day's labour. (3) A system of emigration would render more "practicable

(1) Acc. and Pap., 1826-7, 550, p.4.

(2) Ibid., p.7.

(3) Ibid., p.391.

the abrupt discontinuance of such relief, and was on this ground particularly recommended by Malthus. Emigration was held to be applicable rather to rural than urban districts in England. This was due not only to the greater fitness of the destitute farm labourer as a subject for emigration, but also to the greater security against the recurrence of pauperism "to be looked for in the well-understood interest of the ratepayer in parishes purely agricultural". In towns, "the owners of inferior houses and those interested in cheap labour" benefit by the presence of the pauper.

In Scotland the Committee found no great distress among agricultural labourers. More advantage there was promised by a reconsideration of the laws regarding property liable for poor rate than by assisted emigration. The exception was the Western Isles where settlers of a particularly desirable type might be furnished "with advantage to the islands and the colonies."

The Committee is "prepared distinctly to recommend a pecuniary advance in the nature of a loan" for the purpose of facilitating a national emigration policy. A draft scheme for emigrating in 1828, 1829, and 1830, four, six, and nine thousand families respectively is endorsed. Repayment of the cost of settlement, not of passage, by the emigrant would be required, - ten shillings in 1831, and in each following year ten shillings more than the year before until £4 was reached, at which figure the payment would be constant, the indebtedness being discharged in 1861. A probability of repayment was most carefully investigated. Colonial witnesses seemingly of the highest order, - two provincial

attorneys-general were of the number - were all but unanimous in their endorsement of the scheme. Yearly payment was not to be described, even by implication, as a rent for the land granted. Payment in produce was to be accepted for a term of years. Food would be needed for following contingents of emigrants in any case. The strongest confirmation of the feasibility of the project came to hand later in Colonel Cockburn's report. His investigations in the 1823 and 1825 settlements showed him on all hands "prosperity, happiness and content." He enclosed signed statements in the phraseology of individual settlers which bear the stamp of truth. He found the Lanark settlers of 1820-21 who went out bound to repay the government after ten years' time prepared and anxious to begin refunding the loan. He was able to assert that the tales of absconding to the United States had been grossly exaggerated. In a few cases he could trace, special circumstances such as the desire to join friends there obtained. In all such circumstances their properties had been purchased by residents in their districts. He found optimism prevailing - "none who were inclined to sell". The evidence at the disposal of the Committee was less authoritative and convincing; so much so that they felt the repayment part of the scheme to be its weak point.

(1) Acc. and Pap., XXI, 109.

(2) An authoritative denial of the statements of the Dec. 8, 1825 issue of the "Colonial Advocate", a leading provincial journal, will be found in Acc. and Pap. 1826, IV, pp. 286, 287. The "Peter Robinson" settlers of 1825 were reported to have decamped in large numbers. Voluntary witnesses wrote to testify to the gross exaggeration, among them Mr. Stewart J.P., T.T. Oxton from the Land Registry Office, Port Hope, and James FitzGibbon of Cobourg. Sir Francis Bond Head, late Governor of Upper Canada wrote Horton 21 May, 1828 to testify to their loyalty and to their satisfactory material

An incontestably sound recommendation was that for the appointment of a Board of Emigration to supervise the selection by port agents of applicants for passage and settlement. Such were to be less than fifty years of age and in good health, and to be given priority according to a pre-arranged schedule which placed evicted Irish tenants first. Emigrants who could find employment at the port of disembarkation might decline the settlement loan. Such a board would constitute a labour bureau.

The Committee saw the possibility made so much of in the Thirties -

"A principle of supply may be adjusted, at an early period, under which the colonists of the Cape, New South Wales, and Van Diemen's Land may receive precisely that proportion of labour which is suited to their wants; while at the same time the independence which an indefinite supply of fertile land provides for the labourer, after a few years of exertion, will tend progressively to transmute all such labourers into colonists, and to create fresh demands for labour from the population of the mother country." "In the satisfactory application of that simple principle will be involved a degree of improvement in the colonial system of this country, which can scarcely be anticipated by the most sanguine person." (1)

In conclusion the Committee forestalled some objections to a national scheme of emigration. It would not be a drain on the country because if there were a demand here the labourer would stay. In any event the control would be in the government's hands. The argument that if capital were used to establish the pauper in the colonies the ratio between the capital and paupers left would be the same was unsound. The capital used to settle the emigrant in Upper Canada was now used unproductively to sustain him out-of-

(1) Acc. and Pap., 1826-7, V, 550, pp.37, 38.

(1) work here. Rather since it takes only a portion of that unproductive capital to transmute him into a self-sustaining colonist there will be relatively more capital left at home. The justification of the scheme lay in the real saving effected. This was enhanced by the probability of direct repayment and the certainty of indirect advantages to be found in expanding markets both of supply and demand in the colonies, and in the improvement in the standard of living of the labouring classes in Britain.

The increasing interest in the colonies on the part of the more intelligent elements among the mass of the people during this third decade is manifest on all sides. It is recorded in succinct form in the forgotten appendices of the Emigration Committees' reports.

(2) There abstracts are given of petitions for assistance to emigrate forwarded to the Colonial Office. All classes are represented, from a landowner in the Island of Coll who, the previous year, at his own charges, had paid the passages of 300 migrating tenants and still had 1500 too many, and the anonymous Knight of the Bath who enquired what grant of land he could look for in the colonies to the impecunious sisters whose relatives at Kingston, Upper Canada, would assume their maintenance but could

(1) Mr. Thomas Tooke, who said that nobody he had ever met carried the "doctrine in favour of the laissez nous faire, the non-interference of government" farther than himself, wrote Horton under date of June 16, 1827, strongly approving this Third Report. He is particularly explicit on the inability of critics honestly to argue that the Committee's proposal involves objectionable interference on the part of government. The capital to be used in settling the pauper abroad is now being used in maintaining him in idleness here: it is already deflected from its natural channel. That the state should intervene to use this more productively would be altogether unobjectionable. This forceful, authoritative endorsement of Horton's ideas is reinforced with the subscription, "I quite approve of the substance of this letter, T. Rob. Malthus." "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", pp.13-19.

(2) See next page.

not advance their transportation. Great numbers were indigent persons for whom clergymen or friendly societies pleaded. Many were ex-service men. Not a few were officers. Farmers, tradesmen, and manufacturers, ruined or faced with ruin, offered to contribute towards their removal. 627 such petitions representing groups in most cases, often hundreds, constitute the batch the Colonial Department received in a twelve-month. Reduced to a line or two of official condensation each plea retains the flavour of a human hope. They asked to go because their friends had gone and had prospered. The Under Secretary for the Colonies quoted a letter typical of many such which drew the petitioners overseas. It ran: "Come to the land of plenty. There is no such thing as want here." On that occasion he spoke of the potent influence of the recent experiments in emigration in bringing about a revaluation of the Canadas. "Not a family went out to the colonies without calling another after them."⁽¹⁾ The emigration statistics show how many went; these would-be settlers the government decided it could not afford to send.

Meanwhile such action as the emigrating of the petitioners on the principles of Horton's Committees continued to be urged. The Quarterly Review contended that "the remedy is as obvious as the necessity for having recourse to it is urgent."⁽²⁾ There was a

(2)(from previous page.) Appendix no. 14, pp.354-363 of the first (1826) report; Appendix, pp.477-511 of the last (1827) report. Acc. ad Pap. 1826, vol.IV and 1826-27 vol. V respectively.

(1) Hansard, 1828, N.S., XVIII, pp.944, 949.

(2) 37, March 1828, p.575.

redundancy, but it was the consequence of the system of society, not, as Malthus contended, "of nature". Before the large-scale economy of industry and of agriculture was introduced, the poor were somewhat better off, but not even then, as Gourlay argued, in comfort. ⁽¹⁾ The reviewer predicted that "machinery, like the car of Juggernaut, will move on and be thrust forward whatever may be crushed in its course." He endorses the proposal to mortgage the poor-rates for passages and to advance national funds as a settlement loan. He sums up the argument figuratively. "A regular as well as a regulated system of emigration is required in the stage of society which we have attained; it becomes as necessary in the economy of a state as of an ant-hill or a bee-hive."

The Edinburgh Review dealt with the findings of the later Committee in the same strong fashion in which it had treated the earlier report. It was less critical of the means proposed to ensure emigration, more convinced that the end was imperative. Cost was secondary, it said, where human happiness entered. The west-bound Canada timber fleet sailed in ballast. Surely it could be utilised by government for carrying settlers. If emigration were explained it would cease "to be regarded in the light of a punishment." The alternatives to an extensive regulated emigration

(1) Ibid., p.548. "Mr. Gourlay, whose name, unfortunately for himself, has been often before the public, but to whom the praise of good intentions is due, however erroneous he may be in some of his views, and however eccentric in some of his actions asserts in some of his works that the English poor were civilized and independent an hundred years ago, and that no people ever lived in greater comfort than they did in those days." Wilmot Horton attributed this article to Dr. Southey. Cf. Hansard, 1828, N.S., XIX, 1501

are two. A poor law for Ireland, Malthus has shown, would soon quite absorb the rentals. Against non-intercourse, passport regulations to check the flood of Irish paupers, the writer protested, that Ireland had had enough of restrictions. He urged the government to implement the emigration policy the Select Committee had outlined so precisely, and thereby pay the first instalment on the English people's public debt to Ireland for six centuries of misgovernment.⁽¹⁾

Meanwhile the Westminster Review which represented a class of persons quite distinct from the periodicals referred to above, was reconsidering the tirade of abuse it had poured on Wilmot Horton.⁽²⁾ It was now prepared to lend its support to the emigration policy for which he stood.⁽³⁾

Horton had planned a bill which would permit parishes to mortgage their poor rates to afford the means of emigration to able-bodied paupers desirous of going to the colonies. On March 4, 1828,⁽⁴⁾ he moved for leave to introduce it⁽⁵⁾ as also an amendment to the

(1) Edinburgh Review, 47, January 1828, p.241.

(2) Similarly "Blackwoods", "that Mr. Wilmot Horton had been shamefully dealt with on this subject."

(3) See his quotation in the House of Commons, Hansard, 1828, N.S. XIX, 1501.

(4) Hansard, 1828, N.S. XVIII, 938 ff. Horton's words "a national system of emigration or rather of colonization" show the breadth of his ideas, and invalidate some of Wakefield's criticism.

(5) See details, "An Inquiry, etc." 4th. Series, pp. 35, ff. It was to provide both passage and settlement, that is, it was to be a measure of colonization, not of mere emigration. It was directed exclusively to British North America. To supply labour to the Cape and New South Wales would necessitate another bill, which Horton promised to bring forward.

Passengers Act. The latter was carried, but the former, on which he had set his heart, did not reach a second reading. Earl Grey's ministry adopted the late Under Secretary's plan for encouraging and assisting pauper settlement in the Canadas. The debate which ensued when Lord Howick introduced his Emigration Bill showed that Horton's work was beginning to bear fruit. The many schemes in the air for the improvement of the people were reviewed.⁽¹⁾ The debasing makeshifts resorted to that indigent persons in receipt of poor relief might be kept at an ostensible employment were divulged.⁽²⁾ If the poor laws were to be amended in such a stringent fashion that its pauperising tendencies would be cut off, colonization would afford the best palliative during the transition period. But events proved that the poor law was to stand until the constitution had been re-made: and Howick's attempt to implement Horton's ideas regarding state-assisted emigration had to be abandoned.

Horton felt that he had failed. He realised some of the reasons for his lack of success.⁽³⁾ He saw that 'emigration' was a word that had been better left in the background:⁽⁴⁾ that it had a deterring effect on those whom it hoped to attract, and that it

(1) Bog reclamation, waste land farming, Dartmoor and hens, free industry, and commutation of tithes.

(2) Breaking stones, digging in a gravel pit, wheeling sand uphill eighteen miles for one shilling. Hansard, 1830-31, 3rd. Series II, 895 ff.

(3) (a) cost, (b) vacuum refilling, "An Inquiry etc." pp.35, 36.

(4) "An Inquiry etc." 1st. Series, p.27.

furnished a handle by means of which, on the score of humanity, the scheme might be attacked. ⁽¹⁾ But having once named his project "emigration", he proved unable to rechristen it, even though the first appellation was a misnomer. ⁽²⁾ He did not realise how impossible it was at that day to convince Parliament of the wisdom of investing thousands of pounds annually in social betterment - on a new plan. He over-estimated the influence of logical demonstration as opposed to prejudice. ⁽³⁾ He saw so clearly the double gain to be secured by setting the recipients of poor relief up as colonists, he was so universally supported by the leading economists of his day, "Tooke, Malthus, McCulloch, Ricardo, Torrens" ⁽⁴⁾ that he was completely unable to understand the indifference and the incredulity of the House. Huskisson voiced the attitude of many when, having reviewed what colonization had done for Britain, he said, "But for the state to undertake to carry the pauper population -----was a step surrounded by difficulties greater than any which his Right Honourable friend ⁽⁵⁾ seemed to contemplate."

(1) Cobbett and Sadler in particular availed themselves of it to this end. See the debates on Howick's bill, Feb. 22, 1831, for the views of the latter and the examination to which they were subjected by A. Baring and W. Whitmore. Hansard, 1830-31, 3rd. Series, II 891 ff. Or more severely by Huskisson, Hansard, 1829, N.S. XXI, 1729 ff.

(2) "The first and I may be permitted to say, the main object of the Emigration Committee, was to establish the distinction between colonization, upon the principles of the experiments of 1823 and 1825 and that desultory Emigration which was carried on spontaneously---" "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", pp. 20, 21. "Labour Emigration checks itse lf: colonization may continue indefinitely". "Defence of Earl Bathurst's Administration", p. 30 note. Cf. Third Report, sec. VII, Acc. and Pap. 1826-27, V, 550, pp. 35 ff.

(3) See M. Duchatel on such prejudice, "An Inquiry etc.", 2nd. Series, p. 21.

(4) As he names his "speculative" supporters on May 1, 1829, Hansard, 1829, N.S. XXI, 1730.

(5) See next page.

One of these dangers was forcefully indicated by Thomas Tooke. He held that a weighty objection "to any plan of advances by government, for such an undertaking" was "that the administration or machinery for conducting it would degenerate into a job, and become little better than a mere vehicle for patronage to the board and its members."⁽¹⁾

Horton over-estimated the willingness of his peers to help the poor in Britain; he also over-estimated the ability of those redundant able-bodied labourers, for whom he would provide passages, to help themselves in Canada. Yet his proposals and his experiments are unfairly described by Charles Buller's phrase, "pauper shovelling". Horton proposed no compulsion; he insisted on selection; the colonies were to get as far as possible, "honest and industrious men."⁽²⁾ Buller by implication retracted his telling epithet when, in 1848, he proposed a loan for emigration on Horton's principles.

The failure of the persevering Under Secretary of State for the Colonies as seen from the point of view of the present century needs little explanation. The times were against him. Had his efforts been made in the following decade it is probable that he ^{would} have succeeded to some considerable extent. The Reform Act entirely changed the

(5) (from previous page) Huskisson said Britain's emigrants had "created a commerce which, but for them, would never have existed" Hansard, 1829, N.S. XXI, 1730. On this point Wakefield was to concentrate, and wisely so. Molesworth, too, used it effectively against those who claimed that independent states were as good customers as colonies and that therefore colonies should be abandoned. Following Huskisson they showed that but for colonization such independent countries as the United States was, and as Canada was to be would never have existed.

(1) Letter to Horton cited above page 303 note (1).

(2) Peel, March 4, 1828. Hansard, 1828, N.S. XVIII.

situation. Horton asked a costly innovation before that epoch-making measure; after it Wakefield had sufficient difficulty with a proposal, which though a departure from precedent, involved practically no cost.⁽¹⁾

Perhaps Horton's greatest error was one^{to} which Tory humanitarians, especially those in official positions, were particularly susceptible. He concentrated too exclusively on convincing Parliament directly and on winning the support of economic specialists: he neglected to cultivate a public opinion in favour of his national project. His immediate successor achieved his point where he failed, inspite of unusual handicaps - without office, without even social recognition, let alone a high place in the society of the day - because he faithfully and sedulously built upon public sentiment. Horton complained that he never had a periodical, a newspaper to support him. He never went about securing their support. Yet after the publication of the Emigration Reports all the leading journals reviewed them favourably, while some of them went beyond Horton himself in demanding⁽²⁾ immediate government intervention, irrespective of cost. Opinion was there, awaiting guidance had the official head of the movement⁽³⁾ had time from his controversies and his correspondence to mould it⁽⁴⁾

(1) Horton could not convince members of Parliament that the question was not "the incurring of a new expense, but the more economical application of funds already mortgaged to the subsistence of this pauper population." "An Inquiry etc." 2nd. Series, p.19.

(2) Especially the Edinburgh Review, 45, Dec. 1826; 47, Jan. 1827

(3) With Sadler and the Colonization Society chiefly.

(4) With C. Poulett Thomson M.P. (1st. series); M. Duchatel, (2nd series); Sir Francis Burdett M.P. (3rd. series); Nassau W. Senior (4th series); with Sir Francis Bond Head, the Bishop of Limerick, the Marquess of West Meath; and such valuable informants as Captain Basil Hall, who volunteered information collected on the scene of the 1825 settlement, and Thomas Boyse, Esq. a landed proprietor of Wexford,
(continued on next page)

to his purposes.

Wakefield criticised Horton's whole effort as one of mere pauper relief, as one that made the colonies in themselves purely subsidiary. (1) It is true that his primary purpose was the mitigation of the evil of pauperism: it was "the" problem of the hour: the stricture implies that Britain's good was to be secured even at the expense of the colonies. An analysis of the Emigration Reports and of Horton's works does not justify this aspersion. His aim was a "reciprocity of benefits" between mother country and colonies: his problem, as he stated it in his correspondence with Charles Poulett Thomson M.P., was that "of making the redundant labour and curse of the mother country, the active labour and blessing of the colonies." In places the imperialism of the Reports is tepid. For example that of 1826 presumes,

"that it would be unnecessary to argue in favour of any determination of emigrants to our own colonies, provided it can be shown that the expense necessary to be incurred will not be so great (2) as that which is necessary in their removal to the United States."

This is, however, the exception. More frequently the opinion expressed is, as in the second interim report of the next year, that

(4) (continued from previous page) "whose experience of eleven years in locating Irish paupers in Canada was placed at Horton's disposal. For the latter see Appendix A, "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism."

(1) The first publication of the Colonization Society shows how little right Wakefield had to make this criticism lightly. It was "A Statement of the Principles of a proposed National Society for the cure and prevention of pauperism by means of Systematic Colonization". 1830. Cf. "The Outline of a System of Colonization" which constitutes an appendix to the "Letter from Sydney", p.XVI. "The whole object of the proposed measure is to diminish the evils of pauperism in Britain and to promote colonization ----"

(2) Acc. and Pap. 1826, IV, 404, p.10.

the benefit accruing from the proposed emigration system would be not only

"relief to the British Islands, but an augmentation to the resources of the colonies, and an additional link in those connections of blood and interest which now unite them to the mother country."

This is not the place to review at length the accepted opinion of the capabilities of Sir Robert Wilmot Horton. Yet Charles Greville's strictures have contributed too largely to his discredit. Many laymen still honestly find a degree of unintelligibility in lectures on political economy. That one who was attracted because others were, to hear such a discourse one hundred years ago should attribute his failure to follow the argument to lack of method on the part of the lecturer, is not altogether incomprehensible. Greville's comment on Buller's not being recognised sooner as a man of ability throws light on his criticism of Horton. It was because Buller's "greatest speeches were on dry and serious subjects, such as colonization, emigration or records." In the second instance the critic indicates the standard of measure he applied in the first. Horton was said to "bore the House of Commons (1)

(1) "I have heard that men of high reputation have expressed their regret "that I would continue to bore the House of Commons with my absurd opinions." Within the same month I have received from public writers in England, and from public writers and statesmen on the continent, of the very first authority, the expression of their entire concurrence in the opinions of the Emigration Committee, whose reports they had studied with the deepest attention; and this concurrence was coupled with the strongest advice that I should persevere, notwithstanding any temporary indifference on the part of the English public, in the complete investigation of principles of the utmost interest to the happiness of mankind." "An Inquiry etc.", 1st. Series p.12.

The paucity of members present when the subject of debate was colonial, no matter who might lead the discussion, minimises the importance of this criticism; for that matter it was one constantly made of Edmund Burke.

Horton's writings are not characterised by obscurity nor lack of logical sequence. Michael Thomas Sadler M.P. with whom his most sustained controversy was waged, had no occasion to exult in his opponent's incapacity. ⁽¹⁾ Horton, on the other hand, was widely known and highly respected by the thinkers of his day. His perseverance impressed all of them. ⁽²⁾ He gave his energies during the whole of his official life to the cause of emigration. It was worthy of the self-sacrifice it was accorded. Success in such an endeavour was no "hundred soon hit." To redress the balance so long depressed by the weight of ill-based criticism, it were better to hold that "this high man with a great thing to pursue" died ere he knew it.

(1) Horton's refutation of Sadler's arguments out of the mouths of his own oracles, whether the psalmist David, Lord Bacon, Sir Frederick Morton Eden, or living actuaries, indicates unquestionable ability as a dialectician. Sadler's charges against the Emigration Committees (from his "Ireland, its Evils and their Remedies") are summarised in "Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", pp. 1 - 4, and answered in "An Inquiry etc." 3rd. Series, pp.55 - 71. See Merivale "Lectures on Colonization and Colonies", 2 vols. 1841, I, p.137 for a reference to Sadler's utter discomfiture.

(2) Thomas Tooke wrote that if the same "zeal, ability and singleness of purpose" which the 1827 report manifested could be guaranteed for the administration of its recommendations the success of the national effort in emigration would be assured. "The Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", p.17. See the eulogies in the House from Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Slaney, and Colonel Wood among others. Hansard, 1828, N.S., XVIII, 955 ff.

Horton's reputation suffered during his life-time, as his memory has since, from Wakefield's success. The latter introduced a conception of the colonies as having positive worth in themselves, as deserving to be ranked no longer as means only, but as ends, which transcended the conception of the indefatigable Under Secretary as the theory of Copernicus did that of Ptolemy. It was inevitable that in building up his own system the exponent of scientific colonization should expose the inadequacy of the programme of his fore-runner. Wakefield was such a man as to glory in doing this thoroughly. Probably he did not realise any indebtedness to Horton: certainly he acknowledged none.

What Wakefield did not see is clear today. The very activity of an Under Secretary of State for the Colonies during the last third of the Newcastle-like secretaryship of the Earl of Bathurst marked the beginning of a new regime. A French essayist of distinction, a specialist in poor relief, characterised the Emigration Report of 1827 as "one of the most remarkable documents of the age in relation to the science of Political Economy"⁽¹⁾. Certainly the committee over which Horton presided attracted British attention anew, with a wealth of detail, to the great open spaces remaining to the Crown in the new worlds. They corrected misconceptions regarding climate and soil, and amenities of life. They proclaimed as a theme worthy of glorification - as, indeed,

(1) "A happy illustration of that mode of Parliamentary inquiry, from which you derive so much advantage in England." M. Duchatel to Horton, November 25, 1829, "An Inquiry etc." 2nd. Series, p.17.

it was, particularly in the age of the Reform Bill - the substantial success in homes across the seas of Irish, Scotch and English settlers, many of them below the average in capacity, most of them quite without means. The debates in Parliament, then regarded, whatever may be held today, as more influential than the press, relayed the new facts, the encouraging hopes, the exhilarating certainties, of industry and independence in the colonies. Nor was the press behind-hand. Opposition and government organs alike, standard quarterlies and ephemeral weeklies carried them on to the people. The response was not immediate. As seed slumbers out of sight before it germinates, as leaven begins its work in darkness and oblivion, so the ideas disseminated broadcast by Horton and the Emigration Reports took time to work and spread. The gain was Wakefield's, reaping where he had not sown - Wakefield's and the Empire's.

C H A P T E R IX.

SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION 1829 - 1839.

(A) SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC.

"Little wits that plagiarise are but pickpockets; great wits that plagiarise are conquerors." - Blackwood's Magazine. (1)

"Has any man, or any society of men, a truth to speak, a piece of spiritual work to do, they can nowise proceed at once, and with the mere natural organs, but must first call a public meeting, appoint committees, issue prospectuses, eat a public dinner; in a word, construct or borrow machinery, where with to speak it and do it."
-Edinburgh Review. (2)

Edward Gibbon Wakefield's work, it has been justly said, has afforded "an admirable example of the part which may be played in the development of human institutions by conscious political thought."⁽³⁾

The treatment which follows of Systematic Colonization during the decade of its formulation will be found heartily to endorse this statement of Professor Graham Wallas. The aim of this chapter and of the following one is two-fold; to assign credit to certain fore-runners of Wakefield, and to consider the activities of his school as an influence through public opinion on colonial policy.

The effort to do justice to earlier writers, heretofore unhonoured in this connection, involves, unfortunately, seeming to detract from the merit of Wakefield himself. Such a consequence

(1) September, 1863, p.279.

(2) Vol. 49, June 1829, Article, "Signs of the Times", p.443.

(3) Professor Graham Wallas, Introduction p.XIII, to R.C.Mills' "The Colonization of Australia, (1829-42)", 1915.

is to be deplored. Wakefield's contributions to British colonial policy, despite the appreciation which historians of recognised ability have of late years expressed, has never been adequately appraised. If others uttered his thoughts before him, it redounds to his credit that he had what they lacked, the energy, the pertinacity, the compelling influence over men individually and collectively, which was necessary to bring those thoughts to fruition in action. What his reputation may suffer by the diminution of his claims to originality, his enhanced prestige as an effective force in affairs, in his immediate day, and in subsequent years, will more than make good.

As compared with Robert Fleming Gourlay and Sir Robert Wilmot Horton, Wakefield is well-known. His Quaker ancestry, his relationship to Priscilla Wakefield, the reputed founder of savings banks, and to Elizabeth Fry, of Howard's school of social service, are

(1) familiar. The atmosphere of his home was that of "aggressive philanthropy".

(2) Unless the explanation lie in the adjective 'aggressive', Edward Gibbon's lapse from the conventional in

(3) conduct is hard to explain. At twenty years of age, and again at thirty he eloped with heiresses. In the first instance reconciliation with his wife's relations followed and his diplomatic post at

(1) Cf. Dictionary of National Biography; Garnett, "Edward Gibbon Wakefield", (Builders of Greater Britain"), 1898, p.7 ff; Mills, op.cit., p.76. His father, Edward Wakefield, was an eager Benthamite, a friend of Francis Place and James Mill. McCulloch described his work on Ireland as the best of its kind since Young's "Tour".

(2) Garnett, op.cit., p.6.

(3) The untoward results of a domestic regimen of an unduly puritanical order are sufficiently familiar.

Turin was resumed; in the second, the Gretna Green marriage was annulled by act of Parliament, and Wakefield sentenced to three years⁽¹⁾ in Newgate.

There the prodigal came to himself. How early he settled on colonization as the subject of special study, there remains no means of ascertaining. He writes the year after his release that during his incarceration he "had occasion to read with care every book concerning New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, as well as a long series of newspapers published in those colonies."⁽²⁾ That he had done so is amply proved by his writings themselves.⁽³⁾ In addition, it is certain that he read a great many works concerning South Africa, the British North American colonies and the United States.⁽⁴⁾ Blue-books were studied with assiduity. He quotes freely from the report of the Committee on the Civil Government of Canada,⁽⁵⁾ various committees on the State of the Poor in Ireland, and the Horton Emigration Reports. He familiarised

(1) For contemporary records see Gentleman's Magazine, 1827, pt. I, p.360; Trial of Edward Gibbon Wakefield at Lancaster Assizes March 23; p.458, Sentence, May 14; p.550 second reading of the marriage annulment bill, May 30

(2) "The Punishment of Death", 2nd. Ed., 1832, p.200.

(3) See for example "The Letter from Sydney", 1829, p.4 passim "England and America", 1833, II, 31 passim.

(4) Cf. "The Letter from Sydney", p.72, 77 note, 117, 160-165, 204, 206, 212, 213; "England and America", I, p.VII, II, pp.127 ff. note, 138; Evidence before the Waste Lands Committee, 1836, query number 646.

(5) "England and America", p.152 note; evidence before the Waste Lands Committee, query No. 655, p.62.

himself in particular with the disposal of waste land in the colonies, not only with those negations of system prevailing in his own day, but also with the methods of land-granting of the Dutch, French and Spanish in the years preceding British occupation. Associated with this research in colonial policy was his study of secondary punishment. His volume on "The Punishment of Death" was first published in 1831. It alone of his writings until the year 1849 bore his name on the title-page. It quickly achieved recognition.⁽¹⁾ On this subject Wakefield was first heard before a Parliamentary Committee,⁽²⁾ a means to the creation of opinion of which he was to make full and effective use in succeeding years.

It is repeated in works on this leader in Systematic Colonization that his "peculiar doctrines" had their birth in the failure of the government's attempt at colonization in Western Australia in 1829.⁽³⁾ Wakefield himself describes "the blind blundering at Swan River" as the origin of his ideas of land disposal with a view to the provision of labourers for hire.⁽⁴⁾ A very little consideration should indicate that this explanation, supported though it is by the words of the author, cannot be

(1) Cf. Quarterly Review, vol. 47, pp. 176 ff.

(2) Acc. and Pap. 1831, VII, 276.

(3) R.C. Mills, op.cit., p.80, traces it to the "Colonial Gazette", July 29, 1840; Garnett, op.cit., p.85, asserts that Wakefield made such an assertion before the Colonial Lands Committee. This seems not to be substantiated.

(4) Or rather, as the origin of "the ideas of the founders of the Colonization Society", "Art of Colonization", 1849, p.43. cf. p.53, "It would be affectation to pretend, that in the labours of the theorists of 1830, I have had any but the principal share."

entertained. "The Letter from Sydney" made its appearance serially in the Morning Chronicle, ten instalments following the initial one in August 1829. A "Sketch of a proposal for colonizing Australasia" had been written even earlier that year. With slight variations it reappeared as an "Outline of a System of Colonization" appended to the "Letter from Sydney" when published in book form late in the same year. The first "Regulations as to Settlers in Western Australia" issued by the Colonial Office bear the date January 13, 1829.⁽¹⁾ It is self-evident that Wakefield could not have had at his hand the actual results of the "blind blundering" he refers to when he wrote his first pamphlet on colonization, nor yet the epoch-making letters of a supposititious settler in New South Wales.

At the outset it is clear that Wakefield regarded the obligation of truthfulness somewhat lightly.⁽²⁾ A careful study of his utterances and his writings progressively confirms this view. A reason for assigning other than the true source of his theories must be sought. To the inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies regarding what was, in his opinion, "the most striking practical case of evil resulting from too great a profusion in granting land", he replied "The most striking, because⁽³⁾ it happens to be the last, is the new settlement of Swan River." This was in 1836. In Horton's case.

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, Appendix No.5, pp.255, 256; Official Amendments of February 1829, and July 1830 follow. These served Wakefield as an illustration of the vacillation and self-contradiction of the Colonial Office; see his evidence, *ibid.* p.44. Cf. "England and America", II, pp.171, 172, 173.

(2) Roebuck asked him before the Waste Lands Committee, "When was it that your peculiar doctrines on colonization were first broached?" His reply was, "In 1830." Acc. & Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.17 Query No. 1025. Cf. NO.889, p.94, "Seven years ago (i.e. in 1829) I was as ignorant on this subject as one of these chairs."

(3) *Ibid.* p.53, Query No. 590.

Wakefield had seen the disastrous consequences of basing an argument, intended to win the approval of the public, too completely on speculative reasoning. ⁽¹⁾ The Swan River failure was hard matter of fact. It was also recent. He saw that his struggle was to be largely with the Colonial Office. If he could base his theory on an egregious failure on the part of that Office he would start with an important strategical advantage.

If Wakefield had needed the aid of sophistry to reassure himself in assigning the origin of his ideas to the Swan River fiasco, he could easily have found it. His sta^tement of 1849 but affirmed what the public had assumed. And, again, it was immediately after the Perth settlement was launched that he began these representation^s to the Colonial Office which led to the introduction of the principle of sale rather than free grant of wild land. ⁽²⁾ So that the miscarriage of the last colony was the immediate cause of the first active agitation on Wakefield's part. Further, the "Art of Colonization" traces the ideas not specifically of Wakefield himself but of "the founders of the Colonization Society" to this source. Of them, Wakefield was, of course, but one.

(1) Horton confessed that he found that the House did not like "the views of speculative men." Hansard, 1829, N.S. XXI, 1722.

(2) "Ever since May 1829, the Colonial Department in London has been urged, in various ways, to adopt the American plan of selling waste land, instead of jobbing it according to the English plan." "England and America", II, pp.159, 160, note. Robert Gouger, whose name figures as editor of "The Letter from Sydney", was Wakefield's go-between in communications with the Colonial Office. From the index of the Quarterly Review it seems that Gouger was regarded as the author of the first important ^{publication} of the Colonization Society, "A Statement of the Principles and Objects of a proposed National Socie Society of the cure and prevention of pauperism by means of Scientific Colonization." Cf. Quarterly Review, 43, May 1830, pp.242 -277.

Dr. Garnett conjectures that during his imprisonment his mind was turned to the colonies with a view to the rehabilitation of his name and fortunes.⁽¹⁾ It would not be difficult to find internal evidence in his chapter on transportation in "The Punishment of Death"⁽²⁾ for this inference. He writes as he only could who had himself directed his mind to a new colonial home and felt the falling away of interest in his immediate surroundings. Yet with one who could impose the imaginary letters of a colonist on the general public as successfully as Wakefield did, this would be unsafe ground on which to venture. While his biographer's theory is very plausible, it is nothing more. It is safe to assume, however, that whatever his reasons, he devoted his attention to colonial affairs shortly after entering Newgate. And also, that his basic principles presented themselves to him before he saw the Swan River regulations of January 1829.

Many of the ideas which are essential parts of the theory of Systematic Colonization were extant when Wakefield's attention was turned to the subject. They were to be found here and there in the works of a not inconsiderable number of writers. Living statesmen had given utterance to some of them in recent years, and in one or two not unimportant particulars had acted upon, or been about to act upon them. Fugitive pieces in the periodical literature of the day can be traced which contain what must have been

(1) "Edward Gibbon Wakefield", p.59.

(2) "The Punishment of Death", pp. 192, 199, 201; Cf. "The Art of Colonization", p.129.

suggestive material for such a mind as Wakefield's, receptive as his was while in durance. But how many of these fairly well worked out principles he encountered, and still more, how many of them he adopted, it is difficult, almost impossible to say. Yet there were details in which the probabilities approximate to certainty respecting his indebtedness to his predecessors.

In his most pretentious work, "The Art of Colonization" he manifests a strong tendency completely to discount the worth of what had been written on colonization before his time. His statements have, it would seem, been accepted with too little scrutiny. In "England and America", a production that in many respects is far superior to that which was to supersede it, is a straight clear demonstration, which must be accepted for all it claims, that nothing before his day on colonization was both authoritative and comprehensive.

"Under the head of colonies, we have, indeed, many treatises; but "not one, as far as I know, in which the ends and means of colonization have been fully described, or even noticed with as much as " a show of method or accuracy." (1)

Outstandingly the two best treatments of the subject, he correctly concludes, are James Mill's article, "Colony" in the "Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica", and Adam Smith's well known chapter. And yet the former, although it is able regarding many things has "next to nothing" regarding the objects and means of colonization; and the latter at great length contains many errors. Quoting the

(1) "England and America", II, pp. 61, 62.

passage on "The Causes of the Prosperity of New Colonies",

"The colony of a civilized nation which takes possession either of a waste country, or of one so thinly inhabited that the natives easily give place to the new settlers, advances more rapidly to wealth and greatness than any other human society," (1)

he shows that the very opposite has been the rule. The English colonies in America most clearly illustrated the statement. Since their independence was gained, Wakefield maintains that their progress towards "wealth" has not been "nearly so great as that of England during the same period". To clinch his refutation of the thesis of Adam Smith, he shows the errors in the reasons assigned for the progress of the colonies of Greece. Here Wakefield is seen at his best - successfully daring. (3) So far is it from being true that the remarkable prosperity of these colonies was due to the superabundance of land and the dearness of labour, that the Greek colonists were, in the main, confined to a strip of sea coast, and slaves provided the only labour they employed. Wakefield makes his point. The first of English economists is grossly incorrect regarding the causes of the prosperity of colonies, both ancient and modern: and the article indicated by the last of them (2) as "one of the ablest disquisitions on the subject", Mill's "Colony" in the Encyclopedia Britannica Supplement, is reducible to a pair of truisms.

(1) "England and America", II, p.65; Smith, (ed. McCulloch) II, p.460.

(2) In this fashion he indicates Professor McCulloch who described the Article "Colony" in the Encyclopedia Britannica by James Mill in the words here quoted. See McCulloch's "Wealth of Nations", 4 vols., 1828, II, p.450.

(3) That Boston was 150 years in attaining to a population of 25,000 would have supported Wakefield's argument against Adam Smith. Cf. Merivale, 1842, I, p.93.

In the year 1849, Wakefield looked back on conditions in the field of colonization when he entered it. Two decades crowded with the utmost activity in the interests of his growing theory, and in the interests social, economic, and political, of the colonies, seemed completely to fill the past years. From that point of view he was tempted to affirm that colonization had had been little thought of, either by individuals, or the nation at large when he approached the subject. He wrote,

"Twenty years ago colonization was in no respect a subject of public opinion; the public neither knew nor cared anything at all about it." (1)

When he had written of that period as the present the facts he recorded were somewhat different. His words in 1829 were "now (2) that the public mind is fermenting with colonial projects"; and again,

"Within the last twenty years (1809 - 1829) the same number, at least, of plans of colonization has been suggested, but not one of them has been adopted, or was perhaps worthy of adoption." (3)

Or still more suggestively, as indicating the basis on which he had to work in the mind of a public more or less prepared for his message, he wrote in 1833 in a context characterised by logic and sobriety,

"The uses and abuses of colonization are very different things. While some philosophers have condemned colonization on account of its abuses, the nations of Europe, even when they promoted the abuses, had, one cannot say a knowledge, but a deep sense of the usefulness. That such "unscientific knowledge", to use terms

(1) "Art of Colonization", p.38.

(2) "Letter from Sydney", p.199.

(3) Ibid. p.194.

"employed by Bentham, should have been attended with very "unartificial practice", is just what might have been expected."⁽¹⁾

It will be found that the earlier writings contain the truer picture of the times: that as the years passed, Wakefield's success, and failure alike, combined to distort his view of the accomplishment of others. His suspicion and his acerbity increased as compared with the more kindly, less sceptical attitude indicated by the "Letter from Sydney".⁽²⁾ From these somewhat contradictory passages the conclusion is, first, that there was in 1829 no really able treatment of colonization as a study of means and ends, and, second, that there were many partial treatments or attempted treatments of the subject, and that the people had "a deep sense of the usefulness of" colonies.

The errors revealed in the partial treatments of colonization which Wakefield studied, and to which he frequently refers, seem to have proved fruitfully suggestive. The school which followed Bentham argued with their master that it was not necessary to own a colony to profit to a maximum by trade with its people.⁽³⁾ Wake-

(1) "England and America", II, p.83. Cf. p. 81. "a sense of the benefits derived from the discovery of new productions and the creation of new markets" is a motive of affection for colonies with the people at large.

(2) To take one example from among many. Cf. the reference to Wilmot Horton in the "Letter from Sydney", pp. 180, 181, as "an Englishman who ardently desires the greatest good of his country", with any reference in "England and America", e.g. that at II, p.96, in which his experiments are described as "inadequate", "futile", "childish", "preposterous", and these again with the "Art of Colonization" p.40, and the "shovelling out of paupers" which spread "Dislike and terror".

(3) See above p.194. Quoted to this effect in "England and America", II, p.82. Sir Henry Parnell, "On Financial Reform", 1830, chapter "Colonies", pp. 234 - 257, develops the view Wakefield combatted so strongly.

field entirely concurred in this. But he insisted with justice and acumen that it did not follow that projects of colonization were idle and profitless undertakings. Trade with independent countries was certainly profitable, but, to exist, those independent countries had to be founded, colonized.⁽¹⁾ Further, colonization would create yet new states, fresh markets for the increasing manufactures of England, and for the supply of raw material to her voracious factories.

This logical fallacy, this failure to distinguish "the question of dominion from the question of existence", had most serious consequences. It had its double in the condemnation of colonies as indissolubly associated with corrupt government.⁽²⁾ It was clearly the government, not the colony 'per se' that was objectionable. Whether it was a confusion of colonial monopoly with colonial trade, or of colonial misgovernment with colonies as such, it had wrought incalculable harm already by lending altogether undue weight to the argument for separation. Wakefield countered it strongly. He built up a compelling case for the positive beneficial advantages of colonies.⁽³⁾ Cheap corn was the first requirement of Britain. The colonies could supply it. Those like Australia which were too distant to send so bulky a commodity so far, could supply the tea and silver of China with which Canadian grain could be purchased.

(1) "England and America", II, p.82.

(2) James Mill was cited as failing to discriminate in the article "colony" in the Encyclopedia Britannica Supplement.

(3) "England and America", II, p.90.

In a resumé of the part the colonies had played in creating and catering for secondary wants in the people of Britain, he developed for the Waste Lands Committee as realistic a bit of history as any narrative passage in the "Letter from Sydney".⁽¹⁾ Citing Lancashire he showed that as an agricultural county it would sustain 100,000 inhabitants; its population of 1,500,000 it owed to the existence of the colonies. "I see Manchester and Liverpool the creatures of colonization."

But Wakefield was not the first to meet the Berthamite argument for having done with colonies in exactly the fashion in which he refuted it. Other members of that school besides himself had seen its errors, men whose correction of its faulty logic he could not but have been familiar with. To refer to two such only. Professor J.R. McCulloch, in a striking article on the "Value of Colonial Possessions"⁽²⁾ alluded to above, protested against being understood as finding "the foundation of colonial establishments" inexpedient. With the passing of monopoly (he wrote in 1825) the economist greeted a new era in which colonization without trade shackles might yet afford Europe the advantages that the adoption of mercantile restrictions had prevented it from yielding to the full in the past. Huskisson had given forceful expression to this

(1) "In the time of Elizabeth our Queen had very few wants. Queen as she was nearly all her royal wants were satisfied with beef, ale and salt fish. She walked upon some reeds; and she put on her clothes with wooden skewers. Such were the wants of the greater part of the people of this country." Acc. and Pap., 1836, XI, 512, p.103, Query No. 941.

(2) Edinburgh Review, 42, August 1825, pp. 271 - 303. A similar argument will be found in briefer form in Note XIII, "Colonial Policy, McCulloch's Smith, IV, pp. 406 - 410. See above, 230 - 282.

argument justifying the development of colonies in the interests of the mother-country's trade as recently as June 4, 1829. He spoke with some warmth in opposition to Michael Thomas Sadler's contention for "spade cultivation" ⁽¹⁾ in Ireland. He summarised the advantages to England consequent upon her planting the new world in the statement that her colonies had "created a commerce, which, but for them, would never have existed." ⁽²⁾ Wakefield followed the lead of Huskisson and McCulloch, to mention no others, in this respect. It is repeated that this, and the following particulars, in which Systematic Colonization gathered up the more or less familiar arguments of the day, are given place here not lightly to detract from Wakefield's merit, but rather to counteract the impression he contributed so largely to create - not altogether consciously perhaps - that when his new system was promulgated, the British public was quite ready to have done with colonies, like Samson, neglectful of what enemies saw clearly, enamoured of a financial Delilah, was ready to be shorn of its strength. ⁽³⁾

(1) See above p. 292, note (2).

(2) Hansard, 1829, N.S.XXI, 1730. Peel, of course, included here commerce with the United States. Rather strangely Wakefield's endorsement of exactly this view was absolute: but he regarded that country as still a colony of England. Evidence before the Waste Lands Committee, p.85, query no.822. He defines 'colony' as "a society at once immigrating and emigrating". "England and America", II, p.74.

(3) Wakefield quotes an appreciation by the American Ambassador of Britain's strength in her colonies. "Situated on every continent, lying in every latitude, these her out dominions make her the centre of a trade already vast and perpetually augmenting ---. They take off her redundant population, yet make her more populous." "A Residence at the Court of London", by the Hon. Mr. Rush, Env. Ex. and Min. Plen. from the United States to England. This was the argument Wakefield developed before the Waste Lands Committee referred to above p.328.

Another of Wakefield's important contributions to a just view of colonization was the refutation of a second logical error on the part of "Bentham, Ricardo, Mill, McCulloch and others".⁽¹⁾ It was that of assuming that because labour is employed by capital, capital always finds a field in which to employ labour. This 'non sequitur' was the basis of the objection to colonization that it carried off the capital of the country,⁽²⁾ that "which sets labour in motion",⁽³⁾ and involved "an immediate expense, an actual loss of wealth, for a future profit, for a contingent gain".⁽⁴⁾ Wakefield showed conclusively that it was not so:⁽⁵⁾ that in England capital as well as labour was redundant;⁽⁶⁾ that if idle capital were not used to emigrate labour it could not in any truthful sense be

(1) "England and America", II, p.103 note.

(2) McCulloch argued that "there is plainly only one way of effectually improving the condition of the great majority of the community or of the labouring class, and that is by increasing the ratio of capital to population"; "Wealth of Nations", Introductory Discourse. Cf. Ricardo's so-called Iron Law of Wages.

(3) One of the obsessions of the age. Cf. Edwin Cannan, "The Theories of Production and Distribution", 2nd. Ed. 1903, pp.86, 391.

(4) Bentham, "Rationale of Reward", Bk. IV, ch. 14.

(5) "England and America", II, p.100 and Note IV, passim. Cf. the final Emigration Report, Acc. and Pap. 1826-7, V, 550, p.38; Horton's "Exposition and Defence of Earl Bathurst's Administration" p.30 note.

(6) His arguments were caught up into eloquence by Charles Buller in the House of Commons, April 6, 1843. "Capital for which no profitable employment could be found ----; lent to every government which chose to ask us for loans - sunk in South American mines, or fooled away in the bubble speculations of the day". Given in full in "Art of Colonization", cf. p.463.

maintained that the remaining labour of the country stood in any danger of unemployment as a consequence of that withdrawal of capital. Wakefield has no intention of proposing that the capital of the mother country should be used in emigrating her surplus people. He dealt with this error of the economists merely

"in order to remove a prejudice against colonization, on the ground of the mischievous loss of capital which it might occasion to the mother country: a prejudice, which stops him who entertains it, on the very threshold of the subject", (1)

Associated with this was Wakefield's major principle that one of the ends of colonization from the point of view of the mother-country was "the enlargement of the field of employment for capital." He uses the phrase in two senses, a wider and a narrower one. Here the latter is referred to, that enlargement of the field of employment which is distinct from the domestic extension consequent upon the influence of colonies as markets both of supply and demand. It was not difficult to prove that British capital had accumulated beyond the capacity of adequately remunerative industry to absorb, and that as a consequence the surplus not only could, but did, find employment abroad. Having cited a number of particular cases Wakefield adds,

"Examples without end might be adduced of profitable investments made by the people of old states in new colonies; and made, too, (2) without any permanent abstraction of capital from the old country."

In arguments such as this Wakefield found himself much more at one with the views of Wilmot Horton than he was wont to confess.

(1) "England and America", II, p.102.

(2) Ibid. II, p.108. Cf. above page 243, note (1).

The enlargement of the field of employment forms a very essential part of the theory of Systematic Colonization. Regarded in the broader sense it may be said to include what otherwise constituted the three distinct ends, from the point of view of the emigrating country, for founding colonies, the extension of markets, relief from excessive numbers and enlargement of the field for employing capital. Wakefield puts this all-inclusive object of colonization as "a progressive enlargement, partly domestic, and partly colonial, of the field for employing capital and labour."

To what extent was this valuable exposition his own? J.S. Mill suggested that both Dr. Chalmers in his chapter "On the Increase and Limits of Capital", and Mr. William Ellis in the "Westminster Review" for January 1826, had enunciated theories which coincided with those of Wakefield regarding the field of the employment of capital. He thought that the abler article, that of Mr. Ellis, had probably escaped Wakefield's notice. There would seem to be no particular reason for this assumption: indeed its date of publication might rather suggest that, with Wakefield's bent of mind and his enforced leisure, it would be very unlikely to be passed over. Wakefield himself concedes that Adam Smith "saw that there were

(1) "England and America", II, pp. 84 ff. (2) Ibid. pp.95 ff.

(3) Ibid., pp. 107 ff.

(4) Ibid. p.109.

(5) "Principles of Political Economy", (Ed. Ashley), 1 vol., 1917, pp.727, 728; cf. Garnett, op.cit., p.58.

limits to the employment of capital, and therefore, limits, besides
 the limit of capital, to the employment of labour."⁽¹⁾

But a contemporary economist had also developed the possibility of the relative redundancy of capital, and had coupled his exposition, in more than one pronouncement, with a definite scheme of state-aided emigration. This was Colonel Torrens, afterwards one of the staunchest, and ablest supporters of the economic aspects of Wakefield's theory. Brief extracts from his speech in the House of Commons on February 13, 1827, in support of the motion for the re-appointment of the Emigration Committee, will make it clear how fully the conception of the necessity for an increased field
 (2)
 for the employment of capital had been developed.

"While in Ireland population is redundant in relation to capital, "in England both population and capital are redundant in relation "to land"-----"England has arrived at that state at which her "further progress in wealth and population is retarded, not by the "difficulty of accumulating, but by the difficulty of employing it "beneficially." -----"From all these facts (3) the inference is

(1) "England and America", II, p.103, note.

(2) A bare outline of this speech will be found in Hansard, 1826-7, N.S.XVI, 492 ff. The quotations are made from a second edition of the speech which forms an appendix to Torrens' "Systematic Colonization: Ireland saved without Cost to the Imperial Treasury", 2nd. Edition, 1849, pp.42, 44, 54, and 52 respectively.

(3) Among the facts adduced is a statement of the profit annually accruing to the Federal Treasury by the sale of waste lands in the United States. The speaker suggests that Honourable Members inclined to doubt his adherence to the strict sobriety of fact might "learn from the practical men of that untheorizing country." "If a considerable and increasing revenue be derived from the sale of unappropriated lands, in the state of Ohio, on the American side of the Lakes, is it unreasonable, is it visionary to expect that a similar revenue may be obtained by the sale of similar lands, in Upper Canada, on the English side of the Lakes?"

"conclusive and irresistible, that a well-regulated Emigration to British America would, in a short period, not only replace the advances by which it had been effected, but would bestow upon the unappropriated lands, in the neighbourhood of its locations an exchangeable value, which would yield a clear revenue to the state." (1)

In a passage of even more outstanding merit, of still more unmistakable foreshadowing of the very essence of Wakefield's Systematic Colonization, Colonel Torrens continues:

"Under proper management, the sale of crown lands in the colonies might be made a considerable source of revenue. Who would undertake to calculate the amount to which this revenue might be raised? - who would venture to name the sum which the Treasury would receive for land, as the tide of population and capital flowed on from the Canadian Lakes to the northern Pacific, and as the immeasurable plains of Australia became the seat of a British nation?"

(2)

It has been asserted by R.C.Mills that "after the Wakefield theory passed into the realm of practice", Torrens put forward a claim to having anticipated that part of it which concerned the application of the proceeds of the sale of waste land to emigration.

(3)

The authorities he cites hardly seem to substantiate the statement as he puts it. Colonel Torrens was examined before the Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies on June 29 and 30, 1836. On the former date the question, where to vest the power of disposing of colonial land, was raised. On the latter date the witness desired to add to his answer of the previous day.

(1) The underlining is added.

(2) "The Colonization of Australia (1829-1842] p.133. Mills was unaware of the pamphlet "Self-supporting Emigration," on the basis of which credit for similar ideas are due Colonel Torrens from 1817.

(3) The Report of the Waste Lands Committee and Torrens' Systematic Colonization" are dealt with below. H.Capper's "South Australia", 1837, p.37, does nothing more than repeat these facts without specific authority from the alleged claimant.

His opinion had been that a central metropolitan board should be formed. He had omitted to say that Mr. Huskisson had entertained the same view: indeed, that during his tenure of the Colonial Secretaryship, that statesman had planned the establishment of a colonial land board in London. The First Lord of the Treasury, the Duke of Wellington, had assented to the proposal, having first taken care to inquire if it would involve the country in any expense. He had been assured that, quite to the contrary, the arrangement promised no inconsiderable revenue. Colonel Torrens' authority for his statement to this effect was the Colonial Secretary's own words. When he was further questioned - and not till then - was the fact elicited that his speech of February 13, 1827 had been the means of suggesting the plan in the first place. The witness testified,

"In this speech I alluded to the great revenue realised in the United States by the sale of waste land, and urged on Parliament the expediency of converting the waste lands of the colonies into an emigration fund."

Colonel Torrens was very far from "putting forward a claim", as such words are ordinarily used. The self-deprecatory terms in which he referred to his very pregnant speech were:

"I merely referred to the American system of disposing of waste land, as affording a practical proof that the expense of emigration might be defrayed out of the increased value which it confers on the wild land of the colonies." "The peculiar principles of the plan of colonization now under the consideration of the Committee were not then known." (1)

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, pp. 134, 135, Queries No. 1177-1180 inclusive. "Peculiar principles" are defined as "fixing the price of waste land so as to secure an adequate supply of labourers for hire."

The present day student may well take another view of the credit due to Colonel Torrens than that magnanimous gentleman seems to have done. Especially is this the case when it is known that as early as 1817⁽¹⁾ this forward-looking economist and soldier recommended a policy in the interests of the poor of England and discharged soldiers and sailors which, even at that date, formed the nucleus of his ideas as later expressed in the House of Commons in the speech from which quotations have been made. The proposal was intended as a corrective to Spencean and Owenite projects. Disbelieving in the ability of "political alchemists" to eradicate pauperism, he suggested that since prudential or moral restraint failed to keep population down to the level of capital and subsistence, "a well-regulated system of colonization" should be adopted. "The vast regions of Canada, the Cape of Good Hope and New Holland" were capable "without difficulty and without expense, of providing for every able-bodied pauper." To the man who anticipated in approximate fashion the programme of "the theorists of 1830", and almost entirely that of Wilmot Horton, some recognition is certainly due. He tendered effective, modest support, alike, to the Tory gentleman who constituted himself the untiring advocate of pauper location, and to the non-partisan

(1) "Self-supporting Emigration; a paper on the means of reducing the Poores Rates", reprinted from No. XX of the Pamphleteer, 1817. (13 pages). He protested against allowing discharged soldiers to "beg bitter bread through realms their valour saved". He held that, "under the circumstances, humanity and justice, no less than policy require that we should avail ourselves of the resources placed in our hands by the vast extent of unappropriated colonial territory, and offer our discharged soldiers and sailors, who cannot find employment at home, provision in distant settlements." p.12.

free-lance who championed systematic colonization. The thought persists in recurring that with such backing as Colonel Torrens could afford him, in plain, straight language to his practical-minded peers, the members gathered year after year at St. Stephens, Horton's effort could not fail of real accomplishment, could not but contribute to the keeping alive of the "deep sense of the usefulness" of colonies, and the faith that a means of turning them to the profit of her surplus population would yet be vouchsafed to Britain.

It has been shown that in certain important respects, Wakefield simply gathered up the views for and against colonization current in his day. To recapitulate, he did so, in combatting (A) the objection to emigration on the score of the abstraction of capital it was alleged to involve, and (B) the disallowance of all value to colonies as associated either with monopolies or corruption; and in developing (C) the positive advantages of colonies as markets both of demand and supply, and (D) the possibility of colonization, without expense to the mother country, with a view both to the creation of markets and the removal of her surplus population.⁽¹⁾ He found these various contentions scattered throughout periodical literature, contemporary blue-books, fugitive treatises and the writings of the leading economists. The credit is still

(1) Mills, op.cit., pp.134, 135, finds a possibility of suggestion for Wakefield in a scheme of pauper location outlined by W.C.Wentworth in "A Statistical Account of the British Settlements in Australasia", 1824, II, pp.244-5, 260 et seq. He remarks that the sale of crown land was partially introduced in New South Wales in 1826, and 1828; and points out that Wakefield himself conceded that the Swan River Regulations permitted of the acquisition of land proportioned to labourers brought out on a basis analogous to his own

his for having welded them into a convincing self-consistent whole: still more for the use he made of the system thus evolved from original thought and unrelated fragments.

In the investigation of the origin of the ideas of the Colonial Reformers there remains for consideration the indebtedness to Robert Fleming Gourlay. An earlier chapter ⁽¹⁾ has presented an analysis of his "Grand System of Emigration in Connection with a Reform of the Poor Laws". It has been shown that Wakefield knew and quoted his "Upper Canada". But such acknowledgments are quite inadequate: all Wakefield's major principles appear in the volumes of the other. It was no ordinary debt.

Neglect such as this on Wakefield's part raises the question of his general attitude to those who had rendered him assistance in numerous other cases. He seems to have been careful of the conventions. In 1849 he wrote the passage that follows:

"It would be affectation to pretend, that in the labours of the theorists of 1830, I have had any but the principal share. Whilst thus claiming my own for the first time, I long to dwell on the more brilliant efforts, and the public-spirited sacrifices of time, money, and comfort, which others have made in the endeavour to colonize in spite of the Colonial Office: above all, I would speak of the generous sympathy and aid, by which many have laid me under deep personal obligation: but these topics alone would fill a long letter, and I have no right to intrude them on you. I will therefore pass on, after saying, however, that by far the heaviest of my debts of gratitude is due to the proprietor and editor of The Spectator newspaper. You have not to learn what the influence of that journal has been during its disinterested labours of near twenty years in the cause of colonial reform and systematic colonization." (2)

R. S. Rintoul, the editor of the "Spectator", was, indeed, a benefactor. In a note subjoined to an earlier letter of

(1) Chapter VII.

(2) "Art of Colonization", pp. 58, 59.

appreciation⁽¹⁾ he said, "With the generosity of most high intellects Mr. Wakefield attributes to the aid of others successes commanded by his own great powers." Before the Colonial Lands Committee⁽²⁾ Wakefield praised Colonel Torrens. In "England and America", he has appreciation for Lord Howick and for Mr. Gouger, the Secretary, and for various leading members of the Colonization Society.⁽³⁾ It is true that he quarrelled with both the gentlemen named a little later, and disparaged their services. Indeed, Wakefield's biography reveals a series of quarrels with freinds⁽⁴⁾ with whom he had worked in closest harmony. For a time even the friendship with Charles Buller was in jeopardy.⁽⁵⁾ How far his lack of scruples as to the means he adopted to gain his ends enters is difficult to say. Exaggeration was permissible: truth, itself, was⁽⁶⁾ not a stay. The last instance of a disregard for strict accuracy appears in the long quotation made just above. It was not in the "Art of Colonization", from which the passage is taken, that he claimed his own for the first time. He had done that fourteen

(1) "Spectator", Dec, 4, 1841, quoted in Mills, op.cit., pp, 145 and 146.

(2) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.105, query No. 950.

(3) Vol. II, pp.160, 161, note.

(4) Cf. Garnett, op.cit., p.319.

(5) Wakefield said Earl Grey had spoiled Buller as a colonial reformer, Garnett, op.cit., p.291; The year after Buller's death he described him as his "alter ego", "Art of Colonization", p.33.

(6) See the statement of the misfortunes of the Swan River settlers as given to the Colonial Lands Committee, pp. 53, 54, query No. 591.

years before with much more explicitness regarding the absolutely unique part he had played in the agitation for systematic colonization. His letter of June 2, 1835 to the South Australian Colonization Commissioners was not a letter he could possibly forget (1) The conclusion to which one is forced is that Wakefield's habitual code of conduct was not such as would require him to go out of his way to acknowledge a literary indebtedness to such an unfortunate (2) as Gourlay.

This explanation is arrived at after the most careful consideration, and is recorded with regret. None other is adequate. To justify Wakefield's action on the ground that any assistance derived from such a confused medley as Gourlay's work on Canada, was amply paid for by the labour of gaining it, would be the veriest sophistry. None the less, it is true that if extenuation for a failure to acknowledge the wholesale use of the thought of another could ever be found in the provokingly involved and repetitious nature of the original work, it might certainly be found here. Gourlay's "Statistical Account of Upper Canada" can be compared to nothing more appropriately than to the prologue of Bottom the weaver. It is "like a tangled chain; nothing impaired, but all disordered." Wakefield had time to shake its knotted links free.

(1) Appendix to the Second Report of the Select Committee on South Australia. Acc. and Pap. 1841, IV, 394, App. pp. 332-339.

(2) See above p.218, and note (5). After the assault upon Brougham, Gourlay was declared to be deranged and was incarcerated in Colbathsfield House of Correction. Conolly, op.cit., p.199.

(1)

He found, in the first place, a pre-eminent importance given

(2)

to wild land. Its superabundance was an evil. From that sprang political corruption on the one hand, and an enervating dispersion of settlers on the other. To over-come the one difficulty, metropolitan control of crown lands was recommended. To overcome the other, the true specific would be such a restriction on the appropriation of wild land as would hold the settlers together, as would secure "a certain proportion " between the land itself and its cultivators. Each suggested solution is followed through.

The first raises the question of government, the mother country's control of a prime essential to colonial progress: it will be referred to again in the concluding chapter of this study. The necessary restriction on the truly barbarising tendency⁽³⁾ of colonial settlement to scatter itself over unprofitable wastes would be best secured by a universal land-tax. Such an assessment upon the extensive wild lands of the speculator would, in the end,⁽⁴⁾ do even him a service? to the bona fide settler it would be an

(1) Where references are not given in this summary of Gourlay's system, they will be found in chapter VII, above.

(2) "Waste land is the chief element of colonization", Wakefield before the Colonial Lands Committee, p.48, query No. 562.

(3) This is overdone in the "Letter from Sydney", E.G. p.149, "The Americans are a newer (less civilized) people now, in 1829, than they were in 1779." Mr. Poulett Scrope's criticism in the Quarterly Review, 43, May 1830, supplied a needed corrective. Gourlay's language was unnecessarily strong on this point. One of Wakefield's prime virtues was his progressive correction of the errors he found in his theory; the extravaganza of his earlier writings reflects Gourlay much more clearly than his later works.

(4) "Letter from Sydney", App. p.XXI. It is to be noted that in 1829 Wakefield's theory was so close to Gourlay's that he speaks not of the landsales fund but of the revenue from a tax upon rent. Cf. Article II, pp.III, IV.

absolute god-send. Instead of a beggarly, dispirited existence in wretched isolation he would feel contented, happy and ambitious, excelling in activity and skill in juxta-position to and co-operating with his fellows. Social conditions in the colony would attract all classes from the mother country; ⁽¹⁾ civilization there would soon attain the same height. ⁽²⁾ The revenue yielded by such a land-tax should not be regarded as an end in itself: ⁽³⁾ it was merely incidental; it would pay to collect it even if it were thrown into the lake the moment after. But a productive use might be found for it. It might constitute a fund for the transportation of the able-bodied of the motherland for whom no remunerative employment was available at home. Such newcomers might profitably be employed on the construction of such public works in the colony as roads and canals. While the adjacent settlements would benefit vastly by such construction, the immigrants would not only be enabled thereby to repay part or all of the cost of their transportation, but they would also become acclimatised, and acquire familiarity with local conditions, and general experience in colonial life which would at once prove of inestimable value to them. To inaugurate such reciprocally beneficial emigration (and

(1) See the argument for attracting the gentry in Dr. Hind's essay on "Colonization", an appendix to "Thoughts on Secondary Punishment" by the Archbishop of Dublin, reprinted in the "Art of Colonization", pp.107-119.

(2) Nowhere so ably demonstrated as in Charles Buller's speech of April 6, 1843. "Art of Colonization", pp.490, 491, 492.

(3) Wakefield elaborated upon this, one of the strikingly suggestive things in Gourlay. Before the Colonial Lands Committee the former described the revenue arising from the sale of waste lands "As a mere incident, I had almost used the word accident, as something which you have not in view at all, which has occurred without any forethought on your part towards that object." p.91, query 875.

immigration) it would be expedient to anticipate the collection of the land-tax by a loan raised on Britain on its security. The redundant capital of the mother country would welcome such employment. The consequence of such co-operation between Britain and her colony would be a tightening of the bond between them. The prosperity of the colony would be ^a renewed motive for loyalty: it would also be a progressively increasing reason for the mother country's complete happiness in the role of parent state.

Wakefield would not find the sale of wild lands advocated, ⁽¹⁾ in so many words in Gourlay's writings. But he would find an extended treatment of the American system of sale, administered by central and local boards, and described as accounting almost entirely for the striking contrast all travellers had remarked upon between the brisk activity which obtained to the south of the international boundary, and the depressing backwardness to the north. He would find it stated that nature had wonderfully equalised the value of wild lands in the province of Upper Canada: ⁽²⁾ and, in a township report quoted, he would find the strongest recommendation of the principle of sale at a uniform price. Indeed,

(1) Taken in conjunction with the eulogies of the American system this looks like an inconsistency. Reflection shows, however, that Gourlay was convinced that land sale would not work satisfactorily in Canada on account of the large areas already alienated, which would be brought into the market by the government's setting a price on new lands. Again Wakefield followed Gourlay. In the "Outline of a System of Colonization" appended to the "Letter from Sydney", p. XX he states that the proximity of the United States would militate against the successful application of the principle of sale in Canada, in that emigrant labourers would turn thither rather than be restricted to that status by a price set for the purpose in Canada.

(2) The township of Nichol; see above p.247, note (1).

what he would not find suggested more or less fully, in Robert Fleming Gourlay's three volumes would be, using the words with a fair degree of regard for their strict interpretation, that "shadowy abstraction", ⁽¹⁾ the "sufficient price", the principle of ⁽²⁾ selection of emigrants and - what he lacked the patience to ferret out.

Honour is due to Wakefield, greater honour than has yet been paid to him. The question of originality pales into insignificance compared with the fact of accomplishment. Before he had expiated his offence against social conventions, as the court had held he should, he had begun his representations to the Colonial Office and drafted his first outlines of systematic colonization for the general public. These two lines he was to pursue with indefatigable assiduity, now concentrating on the department of colonial affairs,

(1) G. Poulett Scrope, in his evidence before the Colonial Lands Committee, p.182, query No. 1535, criticises Wakefield's favourite principle of the "sufficient price" most shrewdly. He holds that men are much more gregarious than Wakefield imagines: that, consequently, restriction of settlement is not necessary to such an absurd degree that a "shadowy abstraction" need be sought to ensure it. He says, "That imaginary 'sufficient price' described by its advocate as 'the golden mean' I consider to be something like the 'To kalon' or 'summum bonum' of the old philosophers, something more easy to seek than to find, to talk about than to lay down in an Act of Parliament." Yet the witness was an ardent systematic coloniser. He had written the article in the Quarterly Review, 43, May 1830, referred to by Wakefield as very evidently influenced by his first writings, (see above p.292 note2). When "England and America" made its appearance he wrote to its anonymous author in terms of most unstinted praise. This letter Wakefield quoted from at length, with somewhat doubtful taste it seems, in answering Scrope's questions before the Colonial Lands Committee, of which Scrope was a member. p.80, query No.793. An analysis of the proceedings of the Committee shows how extreme Scrope's views were in support of the general principles of Wakefield, though he disagreed with him on the speculative one.

(2) See next page.

again turning to the work of public enlightenment as a means of securing his end - action - until by 1839, beyond which this study cannot concern itself directly with his accomplishment, he had gained the ear of the nation and the adoption of his system by the state.

To speak of Wakefield's system is to suggest the desirability of outlining it. Twice he who brought it together endeavoured to give it formal expression: twice the result disappointed its blindest devotees. It was a system that kept growing. While it created opinion, it was recreated by opinion. As the simplest comment on the weather in such a country as Canada requires conditioning by reference to the province, or part of a province, referred to, so reference to the theory of systematic colonization is made accurately only when the year in question is stated - even then allowance must be made for differences of opinion between members of the school. Again Wakefield's forte was not sustained exposition. His bent was motor, not contemplative. (1) He is at his best dealing with his theory 'viva voce', point by point, as before a Select Committee. Consequently parliamentary

(2) (continued from the previous page,) These were suggested by the obvious evils resulting in New South Wales from the preponderance of males. Wakefield recommended young people representing the sexes in equal numbers. His reasoning in support of such selection displays both breadth of view and ingenuity of fancy. He would choose young people about to marry because at that time they are in search of a home. "You catch them moving." Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.96 query No. 903. Cf. the "Letter from Sydney", App. pp.X-XII. "England and America", II, pp.205-217; "Art of Colonization", 405-416

(1) Of the colonizers of 1830 he says "they were rather a party than a mere school: for it happened that those of them who had chiefly framed the new theory, were constitutionally disposed rather to action than to preaching and teaching." "Art of Colonization", 43, 44. His biographer says that he dictated this work while walking about the room. Garnett, op.cit ., p.280.

reports must be appealed to for what would seem key details. There they are found aptly phrased. Even an approximately comprehensive statement of the scheme of the systematic colonizers would extend beyond present limits. Into three phrases Charles Buller compressed the essential economic principles - "the sale of colonial land, the expenditure of the proceeds in carrying out labour, and the selection of the labourers from the young of both sexes."⁽¹⁾

The campaign by means of which Wakefield put forward his programme bears distinct resemblances to that of Clarkson and Wilberforce on behalf of slave trade abolition. "The Saints", as he who emulated their methods called them, started with a widespread humanitarian sentiment in their favour. Wakefield could find no such emotional basis for propaganda such as his. Patriotism was of two minds: home interests seemed quite as likely to be served by Little Englandism as by any Imperialistic undertakings. Commiseration with the poor on the degrading penury by which they were borne down needed to be convinced that their lot would be improved in the colonies before it would support Wakefield's agitation. That avenue to success had been blocked by Horton's failure.⁽²⁾ But if the advocate of a clear orientation of means and ends in colonization lacked such potential support as the colleagues

(1) "Art of Colonization", p.284.

(2) The vehemence of Cobbett's "denunciation of the attempt of their rulers to transport the redundant labourer and his family" lingered in the minds of many. Cf. Buller's utterances in that connection in 1843, "Art of Colonization", p.495.

of Grenville Sharp found in the quickening philanthropy of England, he had less wide-spread, less legitimate, vested interests to oppose him. The earlier movement fought its battles in the chambers of St. Stephens, in the full light of day, with the nation looking on. The leaders of the later movement were lost to the public view - and interest - in unfamiliar precincts in Downing Street. To restore the agitations to a parity again, Wakefield and his colleagues had the advantage of urging on the department of state for the Colonies a 'modus operandi' which could be adopted a step at a time, while the abolitionists had to carry the very citadel of their opponents to feel that their cause was gaining.

Wakefield's representations to the Colonial Office were begun in May 1829. Robert Gouger was his intermediary.⁽¹⁾ The first pamphlet indicated £2 as the uniform price which should be obtained for Australian lands.⁽²⁾ The proposal was met with official ridicule.⁽³⁾ When it appeared as an "Outline of a System of Colonization" in the "Letter from Sydney" the value per acre to be levied in unappropriated lands was left blank.⁽⁴⁾ In the meantime

(1) In 1833 Wakefield wrote "The successful issue of Mr. Gouger's long contest with the judgments of ignorance, the insults of pride and the delays of idleness, should be a lesson of encouragement to the advocates of useful projects". "England and America" II, p.161 note.

(2) "Sketch of a proposal for colonizing Australasia", printed and circulated but not sold, in 1829. Ibid., II, 162, *cf.* "England and America".

(3) Ibid. II, p. 160 note. Sir George Murray, Secretary of State for War and the Colonies (May 1828 - Nov. 1830) said the government wished to discourage emigration. The distinction the reformers made between emigration and colonization was lost on him. "Art of Colonization", p.41.

(4) "Letter from Sydney", Appendix, "Outline of a System of Colonization", Article I, p.III.

the serial publication of the latter work proved, in the words of Professor Egerton, a veritable 'tour de force'.⁽¹⁾ To the man in the street it brought an idea of a perfectly practical scheme for assisted emigration without cost to the parent state.

"When Englishmen or Americans have a public object, they meet, appoint a chairman and secretary, pass resolutions, and subscribe money: in other words, they set to work for themselves, instead of waiting to see what their government may do for them."⁽²⁾

Wakefield's associates in such action were not more than twelve in number.⁽³⁾ Their names are not ascertainable with certainty.⁽⁴⁾

Among them were Charles Buller, John Stuart Mill, George Grote, Robert Stephen Rintoul, John Hutt M.P., Richard Davies Hanson and Robert Gouger. They organised the National Colonization Society with the last named as secretary. Their chief function as a society would seem to have been as a mouth-piece for Wakefield. They published his pamphlets, promulgated his ideas, and spoke his addresses. They were acceptable to the society of the day: he was not. He said of himself that he "worked like a mole". The simile is indeed apt. Dr. Garnett quotes a friend who knew him well. "Edward Gibbon Wakefield was a master in the art of persuading. He seldom failed if he could get his victim into conversation." It needs little reading between the lines of R. D. Hanson's explanation before the Colonial Lands Committee of his

(1) In "King's College Lectures on Colonial Problems", ed. F. J.C. Hearnshaw, 1913, p.151. A "sensation in the literary and political world of London", Samuel Sidney, "The Three Colonies of Australia", 1853. 2nd. Ed. p.92, quoted in Mills, op.cit., p.82.

(2) "Art of Colonization", p.39. Cf. quotation at the head of this chapter.

(3) "Art of Colonization" p.40: "an unknown and feeble body, composed chiefly of very young men, some of whose names, however have long ceased to be obscure, whilst others are amongst the most celebrated of our day."

(4) See next page.

association with the colonial reformers to realise that he was one of those Wakefield "got" for systematic colonization. His testimony shows that in 1829 he was studying conditions in Upper Canada with a view to emigration when he came under the influence of the critic-in-chief of jobbery in the disposal of wild land.⁽¹⁾ Robert Gouger's case was somewhat similar save that his inclinations in emigration, before he came into contact with Wakefield, drew him towards Australia. Instant in season and out of season, all things to all men, Wakefield's apostolic devotion gained adherents, stimulated the exertion of his group of believers, bore fruit in the Colonial Office itself.

It has been suggested that the Colonial Reformers were tempted to exaggerate the apathy and indifference regarding things colonial which reigned when their agitation was launched. Such statements as that of the 1849 retrospect, that, "excepting the stir which (Horton's) strenuous efforts made for a while, I can recollect no mark, previous to 1830, of the slightest public interest even in emigration", is a clear case in point.⁽²⁾ It has been shown that there was a wide-spread interest in the Cape settlement scheme of 1819, to cite but one instance. But there

(4) (continued from previous page) Garnett, op.cit. p. 88. Sir William Molesworth in opposition to Garnett's statement would not appear to have been an original member of the society. Mrs. Rawcett, "Life of Sir William Molesworth", 1901, p.137.

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.26, query 237. The next question, "You are prepared to go into an account of the system under which waste land has been granted from the earliest time?" yaken in conjunction with R.D.Hanson's ready review of colonial history from the time of Sir Humphrey Gilbert indicates that he was still under the spell of the magician, in brief that Wakefield had coached him for his part and that the chairman of the Committee, Mr Henry George Ward M.P. was not altogether oblivious to the fact.

(2) "Art of Colonization", p.39.

was ground for criticism of this kind, if not of this degree. Sir Henry Parnell's Committee on Finance in 1828, by revealing the wasteful expenditure in the colonies concealed from Parliament under the heading "Army Extraordinaries", had revived the natural but illogical objection to overseas possessions on this score. (1) His work on "Financial Reform" enforced the argument. (2) There were only three ways (3) in which colonies could be of any advantage; affording homes to distressed Englishmen was not one of these. There was also positive statement in defence of the colonies, the criticism of the arguments just cited for example, in the Quarterly Review. (4) Peel's assertion in the House of Commons makes it clear that leading statesmen were not insensible to the advantages accruing to Britain from colonial strength and colonial prosperity. He found nothing in Canada's "situation or climate to prevent it attaining, in course of time, equal power and equal prosperity

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1828, V, 110, 420, 480, 519. See the evidence of Mr. Sargent regarding payments for emigration to Canada and for ecclesiastical establishments in the West Indies made under this heading. Cf. the debate of April 6, 1829, on similar Church of England disbursements in Nova Scotia, with striking figure from Joseph Hume M.P. Hansard, 1829, N.S.XXI, 455 et seq.

(2) Sir Henry Parnell condemned the terms of peace in 1815 as having retained "so many of the conquered colonies". The Cape and Mauritius were of use only to the East India Company and should be sustained at their expense. Malta, Gibraltar, Sierra Leone and the African settlements "should be given up." Even Canada was a profitless burden. "On Financial Reform", pp.255, 256, 257. A colonial budget is recommended p.237. The degree of protection conserved by Huskisson's Act of 1825 is greater than had been anticipated. Colonial monopoly should be got rid of in toto. pp.239, 240.

(3) 1. In furnishing a military force. 2. In supplying the parent state with a revenue. 3. In affording commercial advantages. Ibid. p.250. Cf. Wakefield's reference in "England and America", II, p.93.

(4) 42, March 1830, pp.506-536, Article "The British Colonies" in which the entire thesis is refuted that colonial possessions are to be valued in terms of pounds, shillings and pence.

(1)
with the United States. In their statements concerning the attitude to the colonies in 1830, the colonial reformers failed to allow sufficiently for the engrossing domestic situation. Yet they were willing to argue on the basis of the tendency to political tumult the need of provision for the populace in systematic colonization. (2)
There was a certain general illogic, too, about the basic assumption of the Colonization Society that lack of a positive interest in the colonies was indifference to them and their relationship to the mother country. It did not follow that because few Britons were active on behalf of empire that most Britons were apathetic to empire. Justice to the public at large demands that attention be given to the 'non sequitur'.

At first the Colonization Society "could not even get up a controversy". (3)
Then Wilmot Horton came to the rescue. The first pamphlet of the Society "used in a incautious manner the term 'concentration'". (4)
This afforded room for the criticism that its proposal

"was calculated to produce congestion upon particular spots of land "to compel the settlers to cultivate inferior soil, to render their "labour and capital less productive, to reduce wages and profits, "which are mainly determined by the last quality of land under cultivation, and to render rent to be paid upon superior lands as in "an old country". (5)

(1) Hansard 1828, N.S.XIX, 1518. Cf. Huskisson, *ibid*, 314-315

(2) The new ruling class "may be glad to pay high wages for the security of their property". "One chief end of colonization is to prevent tumults". Wakefield's pamphlet "Householders in danger from the populace" attracted favourable attention. *Quarterly Review*, 46, pp.544 ff; 48, p.268 especially the term "Rotunda-Owenites". Cf. "England and America", I, p.170 et seq. "A single word answers these questions - barricades". Wakefield was quite capable of deliberately contributing to the feeling of insecurity, of the repetition of the Parisian "three days" to force action in colonization as a dedative.

(3) "Art of Colonization", p.40.

(4) Col. Torrens before the Colonial Lands Committee, p.135 query No. 1182.

(5) *Ibid*, p.129, query No. 1138.

On these grounds Colonel Torrens, whose words they are, joined with Sir Robert Wilmot Horton in a press and pamphlet attack on the colonial reformers. The latter, "who was very much opposed to the Colonization Society", got James Mill and Malthus also to write papers in opposition to its views. McCulloch added his quota of publicity-bringing criticism. His point was that a restriction in the freedom of appropriation of new land was in opposition to the universally accepted principle that the individual was the best judge of his own interest. It was perfectly easy for Wakefield through members of the Society to demonstrate that, scientifically applied, his theories would facilitate rather than retard the exercise of perfect freedom of appropriation.

Indeed the theorists of 1830 were so keen on this very necessity of unrestricted access to all waste lands that they must have seemed inadequately appreciative of the first concessions of the Colonial Office to their point of view. ⁽¹⁾ Late in 1830 Earl Grey succeeded to the administration of the affairs of the country, his son, Lord Howick being an Under Secretary to Lord Goderich in the Colonial Office. Lord Howick had been attracted by the principle of sale of crown land. Through his influence, first, gratuitous grants were discontinued, then, sale by auction at a uniform upset

(1) The credit for the appointment of an Emigration Commission in June 1831, must be shared by the Colonization Society with the recommendation of the 1827 Emigration Committee. The Colonial Office provided the new board with an office, a secretary, Mr. T.F. Elliot, but no funds. Its function was to supply information to would-be emigrants. Cf. "The Penny Magazine", April 14, 1832, p.17, published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. It gives prominence on this date to a tract of the Commissioners, "Information ---- respecting the British Colonies in North America", price 2d.

price (5/- in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land) was enforced. (1)

The reformers gave Lord Howick credit in stinted fashion; Wakefield, with suspicions unfortunately too characteristic of him, found in "his awkward attempt" a plot to discredit the principles of the systematic colonizers by a partial, and, therefore,

unsuccessful application of them. (2) Five shillings an acre was too low a price,, the charge was a mere office regulation with no guarantee of permanence, and freedom of appropriation was very seriously circumscribed by the option of the governor regarding the areas within these colonies open for purchase and settlement. Such were his criticisms.

It is quite probable that a more conciliatory attitude, the expression of at least a politic appreciation (3) of the recognition of the provision of information for emigrants as a government function, of the adoption of the principle of land sale at a uniform

(1) These were the Ripon Regulations. They were dated Feb. 14, 1831. Cf. Charles Buller's acknowledgment of "how much we owe to others who had the opportunity, when in office, of giving executive effect to improved principles" with Wakefield's scanty praise.

(2) "Art of Colonization", pp.45, 46. The earlier reference "England and America", p.160, note, is less grudging.

(3) Wakefield says, "Art of Colonization", p.40, that Lord Howick's efforts were praised for politic reasons. His writings generally suggest that it was done with an ill grace.

upset price, finally, of the advance of £8 towards the cost of passages to females between the ages of fifteen and thirty willing
 (1)
 to emigrate, had advanced the cause of the Colonization Society more rapidly. Even as it was they were making progress. The Ripon Regulations had condemned the free grant of lands in their language, and justified the new system on their formulae. The controversy with Horton, in addition to winning for their theories the attention of the leading economists, had resulted in winning Colonel Torrens himself as, in his own words, "a decided approver
 (2)
 and advocate for the system." Before the end of 1831 some eight pamphlets had been printed and circulated, lectures to literary societies had been delivered. The press had been kept supplied with information, articles and reviews. Eleven letters had appeared in the "Spectator". Most of the time and labour these things entailed had been Wakefield's. But, impatient of half measures, he had long been considering the establishment of an entirely new colony in which his principles should be applied from
 (3)
 the start. In the old colonies previous wholesale alienations

(1) The Colonization Society claimed to have accomplished this. "England and America", II, p.215 note. An anonymous pamphlet "Plan of the General Land and Emigration Company", London, 1836, a purely commercial prospectus treats it as common knowledge that in 1831 the land sales fund in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land was ear-marked for emigration purposes, p.23. This interesting document seems never to have been mentioned in this connection.

(2) Evidence before the Colonial Lands Committee p.130, query No. 1138. "England and America", p.160 note. "Art of Colonization" pp.40, 41 note.

(3) An early proposal regarding the South Australia colony was made by Major Bacon in Feb. 1831: another by Mr. Gouger to Lord Howick in June. "England and America", App.III, p.322. At the latter suggestion it was renewed by deputation (Messrs. Torrens, Bacon, Gouger and Graham) to Lord Goderich in the early autumn, *ibid.* pp. 308, 323. The pamphlet "Proposal to His Majesty's Government for founding a Colony on the Southern Coast of Australia", 1831, was carried by the deputation. All the documents are in the appendix to the Report of the South Aus. Committee. Acc. & Pap. 1841, IV.

of land, still in a waste state, militated against the demonstration of the worth of his theory. Applied 'de novo', success, he was confident, would be immediate and unqualified. (1)

The project of a colony in South Australia was suggested to the Colonial Office as early as February 1831; on August 15, 1834, the bill which authorised its founding became law. The constant negotiations of the interval reflect credit on neither the projectors nor the department of state for colonial affairs. The Colonization Society assumed too hastily that the government's consent to the scheme had been gained. (2) The misunderstanding increased the existing animus on both sides. As chairman of the provisional committee of the South Australian Land Company, Colonel Torrens submitted a draft charter on July 9, 1832. (3) When it was amended as Lord Goderich had suggested, that minister informed the committee that he could not continue to negotiate with individuals who knew their own minds so poorly. (4) His successor in office Mr. E. S. Stanley seemed more sympathetically disposed towards the colony. Its supporters were revived by the publication of "England and America". (5) The joint stock company was dissolved, and the South Australian Association formed to promote the undertaking, a

(1) "Outline of the Plan of a proposed Colony to be founded on the South Coast of Australia", 1834, p.16.

(2) They announced the fact in the "Spectator", Oct. 30, 1831. Lord Howick's protest against his personal approval being regarded as official consent was written the next day. Acc. & Pap. 1841, IV, App. p.1.

(3) Ibid. App. pp.1-16.

(4) Hay to Torrens, August 6, 1832, ibid. App. p.19.

(5) "Art of Colonization", p.47.

body which would not be susceptible to the charge of jobbery. And then it appeared that the Colonial Secretary preferred a concern that had a pecuniary interest in good government in the new settlement! (1) Colonial Office control, also, was demanded. The Association had abandoned the political part of the project, and had submitted the rough draft of a bill when Stanley quitted office. Spring Rice, his successor, a school-fellow of Wakefield's, according to the latter promised, before receiving the seals of office, to forward the Association's interests. (2) But ministerial neutrality was all the assistance in the legislature that could be expected for the South Australia bill. In the House of Lords, the Duke of Wellington "with a prompt facility, for which his great influence accounts, lifted our poor measure over all obstacles" (3) The Act (4) was a compromise between Wakefield's principles and the government's prejudices. (5) It was the best the systematic colonizers could obtain. Wakefield said of it:

"It will be the first colony founded by Englishmen, in a genial climate, free from the evils of the slave or convict system, and at the same time provided with the requisite amount of labour: it will be the first instance for many years of a colony in which the Governor does not possess the power of withholding from the settlers lands the best adapted for settlement, bestowing them upon persons who have neither the means nor wish to bring them into cultivation. It will be the first colony in which provision is made for the due appropriation of land in exact proportion to the increase of the number of the colonists, and their means of employing it; and, in short, it will be the first colony ever established with any intelligent perception of the ends of Colonization, and the means to be employed for their attainment." (6)

(1) Acc. & Pap. 1841, IV, App. pp. 33, 34.

(2) "Art of Colonization", p. 47. (3) Ibid. p. 48.

(4) 4 & 5 William IV c. 95.

(5) "Art of Colonization", p. 49, "Yet they trusted that "with very good execution the new principle in colonization would come well out of the trial."

(6) "Outline of the Plan of a proposed Colony to be founded on the South Coast of Australia", 1834, p. 17.

A very considerable interest on the part of the public had been awakened by the proposed colony. The pamphlet literature on which the interest was fed was extremely well done. The publication of 1834 noted below is an example of Wakefield, as the colony promoter, at his best. Extracts from all the recent (1) explorers; evidence from actual visitors to the proposed site in the form of question and answer; maps, comparisons, arguments - the whole surprisingly calculated to stimulate the investment of a shrewd business man, and, at the same time, to excite the latent spirit of adventure so thoroughly English. The delay occasioned by Lord Goderich broke up the first party of emigrants that had been gathered. But the proposal had taken such a firm (2) hold of such an influential group that ultimate success was

(1) From Captain Flinders 1802-3 to Captain Stuart 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831.

(2) South Australian Association.

Provisional Committee.

W. Wolryche Whitmore, Esq. M. P. Chairman.

Aubrey Beauclerk, Esq. M.P.
 Abraham Borradaile, Esq.
 Charles Buller, Esq. M.P.
 William Clay, Esq. M.P.
 William Cowan, Esq.
 George Grote, Esq. M.P.
 Benjamin Hawes, Esq. M.P.
 Rowland Hill, Esq.
 Matthew D. Hill, Esq. M.P.
 William Hutt, Esq. M.P.
 John Melville, Esq.
 Jacob Montefiore, Esq.
 Samuel Mills, Esq.

George Warde Norman, Esq.
 Richard Norman, Esq.
 Thomas Pottinger, Esq.
 J. A. Roebuck, Esq. M.P.
 John Romilly, Esq. M.P.
 G. Poulett Scrope, Esq. M.P.
 Dr. Southwood Smith.
 Edward Strutt, Esq. M.P.
 Colonel Torrens, M.P.
 H. G. Ward, Esq. M.P.
 Henry Warburton, Esq. M.P.
 John Wilks, Esq. M.P.

Treasurer - George Grote, Esq. M.P.

Solicitor - Joseph Parkes, Esq.

Honorary Secretary - Robert Gouger, Esq.

(from "Outline of the Plan of a proposed Colony to be founded on the South Coast of Australia", p.2. Cf. "England and America", II, p.305)

(1)

guaranteed. Wakefield's efforts were doubled: many of his coterie did yeoman service. Their combined efforts deserved more than the modified success which was all that was humanly possible under the South Australia Act.

(1) In his letter of June 2, 1835, to the South Australian Commissioners, Wakefield bases his right to offer suggestions, especially to recommend the "sufficient price", in the following statement.

"Nearly seven years ago I was induced to inquire into the causes of the disasters which, without a single exception, have befallen new colonies that were planted in an extensive country by emigrants from a civilised state. This inquiry suggested to me a plan of colonization, which was first made public in 1829. In the course of six years, that plan was adopted by three different associations; first by the Colonization Society of 1830, next by the South Australian Land Company of 1831-2, and lastly by the South Australian Association, who framed the Act of Parliament which you have undertaken to carry into effect. In the course, too, of those six years, the plan has been defended and explained in so large a number of pamphlets and books, that a list of them would surprise you. Now all of those books were written by me, and the whole of those pamphlets either by me or by friends of mine; while I also composed nearly the whole of the advertisements, resolutions, prospectuses and proposals, and of the applications, memorials, letters and replies to the Government, and other documents of importance which were adopted by those three associations. The draft of a charter submitted to the Government by the South Australian Association, and the Act of Parliament which was substituted for that proposed charter, were drawn up by a near relative of mine, under my immediate superintendence. As I was concerned in the formation of those three societies, so with each of them I held constant communication, partly by means of frequent interviews with some leading members of their committees, partly by almost daily conversation or correspondence with some person or other who represented my opinions, informed me of whatever was done or proposed, conveyed suggestions which I wished to make, and resisted, with arguments agreed upon beforehand, all sorts of endeavours to alter the plan of colonization which I had formed. By entering more into detail, I could readily satisfy you that in the steps which led to the passing of the South Australia Act, I have had even a more constant and active participation than appears by this general statement."

Acc. and Pap. 1841, IV, App. p.332.

In so far as the new colony was based on the principles of Wakefield, it succeeded. The sale of land exceeded the hopes of the most optimistic. Emigrants of a most desirable type accompanied those selected by the Commissioners for free passages. For once that selection was a success. The financial straits into which extravagant local expenditure ⁽¹⁾ brought the embryo state was due, as the Select Committee of 1841 tacitly conceded, to the abandonment of part of the original proposal. The rapid recovery which two years witnessed was the result of the sterling worth of the colonists. The chairman of the Commission "which planted the experimental Colony of South Australia" was justified in claiming complete success for this trial of systematic colonization, ⁽²⁾ the evils resulting from divided authority apart.

Wakefield was excluded from any official position in the colony he had created: yet his enthusiasm for the scientific administration of colonies at large remained ardent. In June 1836, the month before Captain Hindmarsh sailed for what was to be Adelaide, the colonial reformers, again in the manner of Clarkson, marshalled their arguments for systematic colonization and presented them to the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies. Here Wakefield could play a part in person. The result was a report that endorsed the economic and social aspects of his theory at all points. Briefly, it commended the American system

(1) Attributed by the Commissioners to Colonel Gawler, the second governor. They failed to prove their charge against him. Captain (later Sir) George Grey succeeded him, and adopted a policy of drastic economy.

(2) Colonel Torrens, "Systematic Colonization", pp. I-XIII, pp. 14, 15.

of sale by auction at a uniform upset price; touched approvingly on the Ripon Regulations; recommended a legislative enactment in place of a departmental order; found that the minimum price should be determined on the basis of local knowledge for each colony; approved a central land board in London with subordinate boards in colonial centres, and concluded by endorsing the appropriation of the net proceeds of land sales to selected emigration, even suggesting the anticipation of such monies by a loan. In Wakefield's own fashion the Committee "looked with quite as lively an anxiety to the welfare of the colonies, as to that of the Mother Country".⁽¹⁾

There was no doubt that in the eyes of a rapidly growing portion of the intelligent public, systematic colonization was the one and approved policy. The idea of wild land as a revenue-producing commodity on the security of which funds might be advanced for the emigration of Britons was thoroughly assimilated.⁽²⁾

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.V.

(2) The chairman of the Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies questioning Wakefield regarding the justification of enhancing the price of wild land if the purchase money were wholly used for the importation of labour for hire, added, "for that is a common idea". Report p.89. query No. 861. The essential ideas of land sale and immigration fund were "described to the Committee the other day by the Honourable Member for Devonport as the only plan which any reasonable person would now think of adopting". Ibid. p.109. query No. 961. Herman Merivale, in his well-known Oxford lectures, used the phrase "the South Australia System" as one of the familiar phrases of the day. Ed. 1842, II, p.41 et passim.

It formed the basis of an interesting proposal, primarily of a commercial nature, contained in a pamphlet of 1836.⁽¹⁾ This was the prospectus of the General Land and Emigration Company (capital £3,000,000) which proposed to lend money for emigration purposes on the security of future land sales. It recounts the American success, the satisfactory sales since the Ripon Regulations were enforced;⁽²⁾ the South Australian prospects⁽³⁾ and the probability of getting the same principles extended by Parliament to all British colonies. It breathes the language of Wakefield; but since that had become the tongue of so many it would be rash, upon a single reading, to assign it definitely to him.⁽⁴⁾

The appointment of the 1836 Committee marks a stage in the growth of public interest in the colonies. Its personnel indicates the influence of the colonial reformers: the selection of witnesses still more the evidence they presented proves that the Newgate student of land disposal had become the Francis Place of a growing movement: the report itself stamped systematic colonization with the imprimatur of authoritative approval. In a brother of one member of the Committee, colonies were to find a novelist of the first rank to present in modern fashion their part in the economy of empire;⁽⁵⁾ in another of its members the next concrete

(1) Cited above p.354, note (1). It extends to 44 pages.

(2) In the last twelve months for which statistics were available the sales in New South Wales were c. £40,000, and in Van Diemen Land c. £20,000, although the principle of sale became operative only in 1832. Ibid. p.21.

(3) 58,333 acres sold for £35,000 cash before and settlement ibid. p.22.

(4) Its circulation was evidently discreet. The copy examined is inscribed "Mr. Babbage, Confidential" It is "published for the Committee by (blank)". Only the solicitors are given, Messrs, Few, Hamilton and Few.

(5) See next page.

colonial project of the Wakefield school found a leader with the
prestige of one of England's leading banking families; ⁽¹⁾ in a
third the wonder remains that Wakefield himself did not find a
publicist and statesman to do his name justice. ⁽²⁾ But with a
fine scorn of recognition in his own day, which suggests that he
had not much cared to know of the comparative neglect of posterity,
Wakefield pursued his chosen path, finding in the restoration of
Britain's colonies to that place in the estimation of his fellows
which Fate had given them in the history of the empire, "the
utmost happiness which God vouchsafes to man on earth, the
realization of his own idea". ⁽³⁾

Two major steps to that end remain to be dealt with in this
chapter. The first of these involved the administration of the
'coup de grace' to that Caliban of the colonial system, transporta-
tion. ⁽⁴⁾ The credit must be shared between Archbishop Whately and

(5) (from previous page) Edward Lytton Bulwer (Lord Lytton)
Cf. "The Caxtons" in MSS. long before its publication in 1849. For
his knowledge of Wakefield see T.H.S. Escott, "Edward Bulwer", p.275

(1) Francis Baring (Lord Northbourne) afterwards chairman of
the New Zealand Association". E.Jerningham Wakefield, "Adventure in
New Zealand" ed. Sir R.Stout, 2parts, 1908, p.9. Garnett, op.cit.142

(2) W.E.Gladstone in the speech at Chester, "Our Colonies",
Nov. 12, 1855. paying a "debt of justice" to men looked on as trait-
ors or madmen, really "great benefactors to their country, by tell-
ing the truth upon the right method of colonial government, and that
at a time when the truth was exceedingly unpopular", names Hume,
Roebuck and Sir William Molesworth only. p.19.

(3) "Art of Colonization", p.33.

(4) To whose disinterested zeal for colonial reform Wakefield
testifies in "Art of Colonization", p.53; and Colonel Torrens before
the Colonial Lands Committee, p.135, query No. 1181, and "Colonial
Lands Committee"

Edward Gibbon Wakefield. In 1831 the latter had testified before a parliamentary Committee on Secondary Punishments: in 1837 he did not appear in person, but by dint of that subterranean activity so characteristic of him, presented to the Committee on Transportation presided over by his friend and pupil, Sir William Molesworth, "such a mass of appalling evidence"⁽¹⁾ that the sweeping condemnation of the system was agreed upon unanimously.⁽²⁾ New South Wales was omitted from the list of penal colonies in the Order-in-Council of August 22, 1840: in 1841 the assignment of convicts ceased. Incidentally the Committee recommended that the price of land in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land be raised to £1 with the familiar dual object of the Wakefield school, the more effectual restriction of emigrants to the status of hired labourer, and the more extensive endowment of emigration.

The second step towards the realisation of Wakefield's ideas of colonization which remains for consideration within the limits of this study, is one that results in the addition of yet another colony to the British Empire, New Zealand. Asked if there were any parts of the world where colonies might advantageously be founded, Wakefield, in replying, gave New Zealand first place. He showed that for years stragglers from New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land had been bargaining for land with its natives. "We are, I think going to colonize New Zealand, though we are doing so in a most slovenly, and scrambling, and disgraceful fashion."⁽³⁾ His

(1) Thornton Hunt, in the "Daily Telegraph", Garnett, p.238.

(2) The final report constitutes an appendix in Professor's Egerton's "Selected Speeches of Sir William Molesworth", 1903.

(3) Acc. and Pap. 1836, IV, 512, p.108, query No. 961

mind had long been turned in this direction. As early as 1833 (1) he had described these islands as "admirably fit for colonization."

Colonization was not the obsession of a monomaniac: it had gained its place with the majority. At the moment when one whose singleness of purpose suggests, perhaps, because it was so largely disinterested, the fixed idea of an unbalanced mind, was about to launch another settlement scheme, a group of Parliamentary groups was dealing with the general theme - H.G.Ward's Committee on Colonial Lands, Sir William Molesworth's on Penal Colonies, the Earl of Devon's on New Zealand, and T.F.Buxton's, reappointed the succeeding year, on Aborigines. All of these were in the years (2) 1836 and 1837. There seems little ground for the charge of lack of interest in colonies.

The story of the New Zealand Association's struggle with the Colonial Office is similar to that which had to be fought before legislative authority was won for the founding of South Australia. Once again one association was replaced by another to placate foibles of the men in office. The association of 1837 displeased Glenelg in that it was not a joint-stock company with paid-up capital. A bill to give effect to the scheme was defeated in the absence of the leading reformers with Lord Durham in

(1) "England and America", II, p.243, note. But was it particularly "fit for colonization" on Wakefield's principles, that is by means of essentially capitalistic enterprise? Cf. Merivale, "Lecture on Colonization and Colonies", 1842, II, p.47. New Zealand was not a country with "facilities for the production of exportable articles which require the labour of many hands in co-operation, or a large outlay of capital."

(2) Even this last excludes committees and commissions on Colonial Military Expenditure and on Grievances in Lower Canada.

Canada. The New Zealand Colonization Company fared no better with the department. The New Zealand Land Company, with Lord Durham as chairman, forced the hands of the government, by despatching a ship with settlers. Two days before the "Tory" saw "the high land of New Zealand", a British governor was appointed. Captain Hobson arrived to proclaim British sovereignty just in time to forestall a French claim to the Middle Island.

Such is the bare outline of a protracted contest. The opposition, in this case, in addition to the proverbial "*vis inertiae*" of the Colonial Office, was the opposition of the Church Missionary Society. Lord Glenelg, Sir George Murray and James Stephen were all officials of that organisation. The reports of Buxton's Committees on the Aborigines had strongly deprecated the extension of British authority to New Zealand. The lay secretary of the Missionary Society, Mr. Dandeson Coates, organised the influence of the Church against the proposal of the reformers. One of the South Australian Commissioners put the matter, as Garnett says, "naively" when he wrote, "If it were possible to get a hundred pious persons to advance £1,000 each, I think Lord Glenelg would give them a charter."⁽¹⁾ Measured by the action of the government the dispatch of the "Tory" was indeed precipitate. Yet the procrastination of Lords Glenelg and Normanby would seem the more reprehensible. The associates of Durham and Wakefield justified their course on the historic ground that individual action had always been necessary in the colonial enterprises of Britain.

(1) Garnett, op.cit., p.152, note, quoting Hodder's "Life of G.F.Angas", pp.208-212.

In the meanwhile the action of individuals themselves in the Antipodes had brought one more colony into being - the squatters at Port Phillip. Although the official formula was concentration, at once on the basis of economy and of combinable labour, Governor Bourke of New South Wales annexed the irregular community and Lord Glenelg endorsed his action, authorising settlement under the Ripon Regulations. This was in 1836. By this time the older colonists to the north had become reconciled to the sale of land, and were beginning to agitate for the application of the entire proceeds of sales to immigration, and the control of such funds by the colony itself. Wakefield's theory had not been accepted to the extent of substituting the "sufficient" price, one uniform, arbitrary for sale by auction; nor were emigrants selected on his principles; but an air of activity pervaded the colony unimagined when the "Letter from Sydney" was written.

By 1839 the influence of the theorists of 1830, economically speaking, had effected a revolution in British colonial policy. A campaign of publicity had been supplemented by a series of concrete proposals addressed to the Colonial Office, on which overt action had supervened. The results deny contradiction. Charles Buller's statement of the success, in terms of emigration and land sales, which had followed the coming into force of the Ripon Regulations is worthy of repetition. Speaking in 1843, he compares the emigration to the Australian colonies in the eight years preceding 1832 with that of the ten following years:

"In the first eight years, the total number of persons who emigrated to these colonies was 11,711, giving an average of 1464 emigrants a year. In the subsequent ten years the total emigration to the Australian colonies, including New Zealand, which had in the meantime been colonized on the same principles, amounted to 104,487, or 10,448 a year, being an increase of more than sevenfold. Nor must you regard this as at all subtracted from the general amount of unassisted emigration, inasmuch as during the first period the total emigration to all other parts was 352,580, giving an average of 44,072 a year; and in the second 661,039, giving an average of no less than 66,104 a year; and this, though during a considerable portion of the latter period emigration to the Canadas was almost stopped by the disturbances in those colonies. And it is also put beyond a doubt, that the fund thus derivable from the sale of lands is a very large one. The sum raised by the sales of land in Australia, during a period of nine years, beginning with 1833, and ending with the end of 1841, including the New-Zealand Company's sales, which are on the same principle, and may be reckoned as effected by the government through the agency of a company, amounts to a few hundreds short of two millions."

"The results in one single colony - that of New South Wales - have been most remarkable and most satisfactory. In these nine years, the land fund has produced £1,000,000; and though only partially applied to emigration, has been the means of carrying out as many as 52,000 selected emigrants, making two-fifths, and two valuable fifths, of the present population of the colony, added to it in the space of little more than three years." (1)

The change the decade had brought in the attitude of the average Englishman to the colonist and to colonial life was at least as important as the change in his attitude to colonial land. The old taunt of Botany Bay had fallen into desuetude. Though there was still a tendency to disparage the post in the colonies mooted for a friend, (2) it had lost most of its force. The passing of transportation removed the plague spots that had been in Darwin's mind when he said, "Nothing but rather sharp necessity should compel me to emigrate." Universally the colonies had been

(1) House of Commons, April 6, 1843, "Art of Colonization", pp. 486-487.

(2) Cf. "The Letter of George Cornwall Lewis", To the Rt. Hon. Edmund Head, July 13, 1837, "I think you have had a great escape in not plunging into a colony. It would be fearful to feel oneself cooped up in the "Kleinstadtischer Geist" for life." p. 86. Cf. p. 90.

regarded as the punishment of guilt, or, little better, the recourse of poverty. Charles Buller asserted that

"The idea of a gentleman emigrating was almost unheard of, unless he emigrated for a while as a placeman; and I recollect when Colonel Talbot was regarded as a kind of innocent monomaniac, who, from some strange caprice, had committed the folly of residing on his noble Canadian estate." (1)

The reformation had been powerfully forwarded by the publicity given to the pattern colony, South Australia. The voluntary emigrants attracted thither were of a class to recall the fact that "such gentlemen as Sir Harry Vane, Hampden, and Cromwell did not disdain the prospect of a colonial career".⁽²⁾ Again it had come about, due to the activity, in great measure, of Edward Gibbon Wakefield who had improvised for himself a new role in the drama of empire, and to the little coterie of reformers his genius and his enthusiasm inspired, that a colonial career was again "looked upon as one of the careers open to a gentleman."⁽³⁾

It was not permitted to Wakefield "to grasp the skirts of lucky Chance" and to reach fame. He dreamed in prison, like Raleigh, of gold unguessed in derided wastes overseas. Like Raleigh, he had a heart for action: but, in a modern age, a less stirring course was laid upon him. With the same faith and

(1) "Art of Colonization", p.491.

(2) Ibid. p.490. "I will be bound to say that more men of good family have settled in New Zealand in the three years since the beginning of 1840, than in British North America in the first thirty years of the present century". p.492.

(3) "Art of Colonization", p.492.

constancy he fought the not inglorious fight against apathy and formalism and false logic. "Never", says one best qualified to judge, "was there a more remarkable instance of the success of a principle against all manner of misapprehension - against the fear of innovation - against corrupt interests - against the inert resistance which all novelty is sure to encounter."⁽¹⁾ Never, in very truth, was success so marked in degree coupled with success so marked in extent. Social rehabilitation in the opinion of their fellow-Britons and economic renewal in their own enlarged activities were the gifts he spread lavishly over the continent and sister islands in the Far Pacific; the same largesse, half round the world, in Canada, contributed handsomely to the endowment of its people with self-government.

As the examination of the origin, and influence through public opinion, of the theories of the colonial reformers as political is undertaken, it is not, perhaps, altogether idle to ponder a moment with Charles Buller, what might have been had their economic and social principles been implemented to the full.

"Imagine what would have been the result, had we at the period in which the American government commenced its sales, applied the same principle with more perfect details to the waste lands of our colonies, and used the funds derived from such sales in rendering our Far West as accessible to our people as the valleys of the Ohio and Missouri to the settlers of the United States. Hundreds of thousands of our countrymen, who now with their families people the territory of the United States, would have been subjects of the British Crown; as many - ay, even more - who have passed their wretched existence in our workhouses or crowded cities, or perished in Irish famines, or pined away in the more lingering torture of such destitution as Great Britain has too often seen, would have been happy and thriving on fertile soils and under genial climates, and making really our country that vast empire which encircles the globe." ----- "This, Sir, is one of those subjects on which we may

(1) Merivale, op.cit., Edition 1861, p.428.

"no embody in precise form the results which calculation justifies
"us in contemplating, lest sober arithmetic should assume the
"features of sanguine fancy." (1)

(1) "Art of Colonization", pp.488, 489. Cf. on the emigration which had taken place, especially 1830-32 inclusive, "The Colonial System: Statistics of the Trade, Industry and Resources of Canada and the other Plantations in British America" by Henry Bliss, 1833, (169 pages), p.4 et seq.;especially foot-note pp.14-17, a protest against a capitation tax on immigrants. This ardent pamphlet is a defence of the colonial system of preference against the attack of the Anti-Colonial party (sic p.164), high in whose confidence Sir Henry Parnell is described as being. The argument springs from the postulates that "the first act and principle of the Colonial System is emigration,"and that the second is "commercial protection". p.163.

CHAPTER X.

SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION.

(B) POLITICAL.

"If any ask me what a free government is, I answer, that, for any practical purpose, it is what the people think so; and that they, and not I, are the natural, lawful, and competent judges of this matter." -Burke. (1).

"----our slowly-grown
And crown'd Republic's crowning common-sense,
That saved her many times ---- "
-Tennyson. (2)

To find a definite origin for the political theories of the Colonial Reformers would be as impossible as it is unnecessary. What they urged was no new thing: with Burke they appealed to the spirit of the constitution: Lord Dorchester was the precursor of
(3)
Lord Durham: their demand was for a return to "the older and
(4)
freer polity" of the pre-revolution era.

None the less their recommendations regarding colonial government were comparatively unfamiliar in the fourth decade of last century. They were even at variance with the views of the larger group, in politics and economics, to which they belonged,

(1) "Works", 2 vols. 1834, "Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol" I, p.217.

(2) "To the Queen", ii, ll. 59-61.

(3) Trevelyan, "British History in the Nineteenth Century", 1922, p. 36.

(4) Merivale, op.cit. 1861, p. VI. Cf. pp. 103 et seq.

the Utilitarian school of Bentham. (1) With the latter they agreed regarding the evils of government at a distance, (2) with James Mill (3) regarding the jobbery with which colonial administration was rife; with both, in the illogical conclusion that the way out was by severing the connection between colony and mother country, Edward Gibbon Wakefield and his pupils disagreed. Their solution was positive, optimistic, imperial. It was self-government. It was Benthamite at basis. "At all events", Wakefield wrote of the colonies, "they must be governed by whatever machinery, with a view to their good and contentment, which is the greatest good, (4) instead of to the satisfaction of their governors only."

Indeed, it was the application of the Utilitarian touchstone, "the greatest good of the greatest number", that involved Wakefield in what has been regarded as the essential inconsistency of his economic and political theories. While the former required the administration of colonial lands in the interests of the greatest number, the people of the mother country, the latter advocated a large measure of local autonomy, which involved, as the people of

(1) A. S. Pringle-Pattison, "The Philosophical Radicals", 1907, pp. 23, 24, refuting Macaulay's exaggerated depreciation of the Philosophical Radicals, attributing to them a real influence "in leavening political opinion and pushing on the cause of reform" agrees that the rapid disintegration of the intellectuals as a political power is "a wholesome reminder of the fate that awaits any extreme party in English politics".

(2) "Rationale of Reward", Bk. IV, Ch. XIV.

(3) Article, "Colony", in supplement to Encyclopedia Britannica printed as a volume in 1824.

(4) "Letter from Sydney", p. 198.

the colonies were quick to insist, colonial control of those lands.⁽¹⁾
 For all this, their divergence from Bentham and James Mill was wide.

Strangely enough this faction of a faction, in so far as the systematic colonizers were partisan at all, found their end, imperial unity, most acceptable in the Tory camp; but their means, colonial self-government, was anathema. The pamphlet, "The Colonial System", cited at the close of the last chapter, joined with Wakefield and his associates in extolling the advantages of the widening intercourse between the colonies and the British Isles, from points of view at once commercial, social and national. The inability of that pamphleteer to look upon the precepts of Sir Henry Parnell and "the anti-colonial party" with any degree of allowance met with sympathetic understanding from "the theorists of 1830." But when Lord Durham's report bluntly and honestly propounded colonial self-government as the means to empire conservation none were more bitterly opposed to such an alleged⁽²⁾ innovation than the readers of the Quarterly Review.

But there is little profit in the effort to reconstruct the lines of party on the question of the retention of the colonies when their general estimation had sunk to its nadir. Even statesmen who, in the House of Commons, had voiced their belief in the worth of overseas possessions were tempted, when driven by the growing demand for retrenchment and economy to consider, even to

(1) John Stuart Mill, on the other hand, considered himself their champion.

(2) March, 1839.

(1)
 suggest, that individual colonies be relinquished. Neither Whigs nor Tories can exult in the face of facts. There were lone voices for the old-time, generous English policy towards communities of Englishmen abroad: they were not party utterances. Among such advocates of empire, Sir James Mackintosh deserves mention.

The introduction on June 20, 1822 of a tripartite bill providing for the extension to the Canadas of freer trade, for an adjustment of the customs duties, collected at Quebec and Montreal, between Upper and Lower Canada, and for the union of those provinces, afforded Sir James Mackintosh an opportunity for pronouncing upon the wisdom of the fullest measure of consideration for the wishes and opinions of British colonists regarding the details of their

(2)
 local government. The clauses of Under Secretary Wilmot's
 (3)
 measure are of relative unimportance in this connection. Parts one and two of the bill became the Canada Trade Act. The third section, which proposed a union of the legislatures of the provinces, aimed at such anglicising of Lower Canada as Lord Durham later

(1) Cf. Wellington's suggestion in 1827 that to save £100,000 to £150,000 Britain should forego the Guinea Coast, a proposal with which Huskisson and Herries concurred adding Sierra Leone. The next year that Ceylon should be taken over by the East India Company was advocated by the Duke of Wellington (after Parnell); while in 1836 the Melbourne government, on supposedly humanitarian grounds, refused to ratify D'Urban's annexation of the territory to the Kei River, Cape Colony. See Edward Porritt, "The Fiscal and Diplomatic Freedom of the British Oversea Dominions", 1922, pp. 297, 298.

(2) Hansard, 1822, N.S. VII, 1199.

(3) The bill, in so far as it deals with the proposed union, is given in full as amended in committee, in Horton's "Exposition and Defence of Earl Bathurst's Administration", App. A, pp. 41 et seq. Horton conceded before the Committee on Civil Government in Canada, 1828, that his abortive measure had not sufficiently conserved French Canadian interests. See his evidence, Acc. and Pap. 1828, VII, 569, query No. 10.

(1)
 insisted upon so strongly. All written proceedings at once and all debates after fifteen years were to be in English. The feudal system of land-holding was to be abolished. Five hundred pounds in real property was to be a qualification for candidates for the joint legislature when next elected. Roman Catholic rights were specifically preserved inviolate. The authority to be extended to the governor of the united provinces to summon two members of the executive council for each province to the assembly "with power of debating therein , and with all other powers, privileges, and immunities of the members thereof, except that of voting" becomes interesting when compared with an analogous arrangement for Northern Ireland implemented by the Imperial Legislature exactly a century later. Sir James Mackintosh's objections were not, however, based on the intrinsic demerits of the proposed union. His opposition to the Under Secretary's bill was that whether good, bad or indifferent, it was proposed for legislation without consulting subjects of the Crown overseas whose interests alone it affected.

(2)
 In a reasoned protest dealing with general principles "the learned baronet", as he is termed throughout the debate, argued

(1) Report, (Ed. by Lucas) II, 296; cf. the objection at II, 323 to the "mere amalgamation of the Houses of Assembly of the two Provinces" such as Horton proposed.

(2) "He did not moot any question of political philosophy" --- or --- "Of constitutional law". His objections were anything but "metaphysical" in the sense in which the Annual Register, 1822, quoted in Horton, op.cit., p.7 used the term.

that since colonists "could not, as colonists, have any legal representation" the reason for their having moral representation was the stronger. (1) Cogency had that evening been allowed to an honourable member who had pleaded the late period of the session against

"a measure affecting the property of a considerable portion of the community. If this respect was to be shown to the body of the publicans and brewers he trusted he might be allowed to call upon the House to show at least some tenderness for the rights, the privileges, the opinions, the feelings, and even the prejudices of two great provinces consisting of several hundred thousand inhabitants."

Arbitrarily to unite the legislatures of the Canadas without (2) notice to, or consultation with, their peoples would have broader effects than would lie in the working of the new scheme. It became necessary "to consider the general tendency of the measure and the effect which it would have on the other colonies and dependencies of the empire." With Fox a generation earlier, "He would venture to affirm, as a general principle of colonial policy, especially applicable to the colonies of North America, that colonies could only be retained, when governed by a loose rein." (3)

Sir James Mackintosh consistently throughout the twenties of last century advocated a liberal colonial policy. On June 20, 1828, he moved for the extension of trial by jury to, and the creation of legislative councils elective to the extent of one-

(1) Hansard, 1822, N.S., VII, 1698-1705

(2) He cited the two years warning in 1791.

(3) Hansard, op.cit., 1711. The Marquis of Londonderry, conceding that the proposal would have to be given up for the present, "lamented that the learned gentleman had opposed the measure in a tone of earnestness", ibid. 1731. Edward Ellice M.P. who had instigated it, and Sir Francis Burdett, somewhat unexpectedly, supported the bill. Charles Buller, "Responsible Government for Colonies", p.70 holds that the rejection of the union bill was an instance of a party motive occasioning colonial injury.

third in, New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. (1) For many other details of a like generous nature there was varied and miscellaneous support during the decade - provided the suggestions were brought before the House. For such general principles, too, (2) advocates in Parliament were not lacking. The chief defect of colonial administration at the time lay in the procrastination of the department in charge; and the self-complacency which routine is calculated to engender in those who follow it unquestioned for years on end. (3) The criticism which the colonial reformers were to offer was very much needed. On two points their contribution, considered exclusively in its political aspects, was to be of particular imperial moment. They forced home on the public at large the essentially un-English character of the bureaucratic administration the colonies were subject to, and they gave substance to such mere affirmations as that of Sir James Mackintosh that colonies should be governed "with a loose rein" by demonstrating that a freer polity was also a safer, and a surer one; that so far were colonies from constituting an argument against, and an obstacle in the way of, general economic laissez-faire, that their possession was the very bulwark and surety, from the point of view of empire, of Free Trade principles.

(1) Joseph Hume M.P. persistently raised the question of unnecessary costs in the colonies. It is probable that his criticism though it was pettifogging at times, resulted beneficially on the whole. For a typical example see Hansard, 1822, N.S. VII, 1514-1517.

(2) Cf. Lord Sandon's, "the only garrison to be trusted was to be found in the hearts of a free and generous people", Hansard, 1829, N.S. XXI, 460.

(3) Hansard, 1828, N.S. XVIII, 1456.

The "Letter from Sydney" indicates Wakefield's views on colonization, regarded from the point of view of government, in general outline only. At the supposed moment of writing the colony is incapable of self-government. The percentage of convicts ⁽¹⁾ is the first reason assigned for this; the second is the "continually increasing tendency to rebellion" inevitable among "a people governed from afar and continually increasing their territory." ⁽²⁾ Dispersion exerted its barbarising tendency uniquely in the utter absense of adventitious aids to concentration of settlement such as warlike natives, swamps, forests or mountains. The democratic spirit "which must exist, where every man possesses a little wealth and a little knowledge, but no man possessing much of either", abounded. "They are rebels, every one of them, at heart." ⁽³⁾ This unfortunate condition of affairs is remediable. Citing the United States of America, he shows that the excess of land in proportion to combinable labour is the chief cause of the deplorable retrogression in civilisation manifested by "a new people". ⁽⁴⁾ The "cure and preventative of newness" is the restriction of ^{the} universal land-hunger. His economic theories show how the colonies may apply this talisman and cease to be "new societies, strictly speaking", becoming rather "so many extensions of an old society." This accomplished, convictism might be relegated to a very subordinate place, British manufactures would be in great demand and "the colonists

(1) "Letter from Sydney", p.65.

(2) *ibid.* p.66.

(3) *ibid.* p. 61.

(4) *ibid.* p.148.

themselves would defray the whole cost of their government and protection."

Under such conditions the bond between mother country and colony would be an enduring one.

"The mother country, therefore, in governing the colony, would consult the greatest advantage of the colonists, in order to preserve their friendship; and the colonists, having much to lose, and being incapable of dispersion, would feel a wholesome dread of war. The colonists, being and instructed and civilized people, would be as well qualified to govern themselves as the people of Britain; and, being a wealthy people, they would be able, without going to war, to assert the birth-right of all British subjects - to enforce in the British Parliament, against a bad British ministry, their claim to equality before the law. Qualified, entitled, and powerful to govern themselves, they might either take a share in framing the general laws of the empire, by means of their representatives in the British Parliament; or, if a mean jealousy on the part of Englishmen should prevent such an arrangement, they might frame their own laws, in a Colonial Assembly, under the eye of a viceroy, incapable of wrong, and possessing a veto like the king of England, but whose secretaries, like the ministers of England, should be responsible to the people!"

In this, practically his earliest writing, Wakefield makes it clear that "mutual dependence" and "reciprocity of interest" are essential to imperial well-being, and that statesmanship may readily bring about such relations. Colonial self-government is the one sound basis. Where conditions in the colony do not permit of the establishment of local autonomy they should be secured by the application of his economic theories of colonization. These latter, it must be confessed, he uses in deus ex machina fashion; and, even then, demands too much of such assistance. Yet despite this exaggeration, the "Letter from Sydney" does suggest, in broad, if not detailed outline, the realisation of an at-oneness,

a common interest, between a new Britain and a New South Wales greatly in advance of the general opinion of the day, a conception with which a liberal policy of colonial administration with progressive concessions leading to local self-government, alone, was consonant.

Wakefield's next indication of his belief in the efficacy of colonial self-government is concrete in the extreme. It is proportionately daring. It is nothing other than that when the male adult inhabitants of the proposed colony of South Australia shall have attained to the number of 50,000 ⁽¹⁾ a legislative assembly shall be elected by the free exercise of the suffrages of all such inhabitants,

"and such assembly shall have power to frame a constitution for the government of the said province, and to make, constitute, ordain, enact, and establish all such laws, statutes, institutions and ordinances, and to constitute such courts and officers as may be necessary, or as such legislative assembly may think meet for the welfare, peace, order and good government of the said province; and that the whole legislative authority of the said province shall from thenceforth be vested in the said legislative assembly so to be chosen, or in such person or persons, body or bodies, as such legislative assembly shall provide to exercise the same; -----" (2)

Until such a population was found in the colony the chartered proprietors, the South Australian Land Company were to administer its affairs with power to embody a militia. The Crown was to

(1) In the first proposal made to the Colonial Office the figure given was 5,000. Mills, op.cit. p.221. "England and America", II, p.249. See above p.355.

(2) Art. 44 of the charter proposed by the South Australian Land Company, enclosed with a letter from Colonel Torrens to Lord Goderich, July 9, 1832. Acc. and Pap. 1841, IV, App. pp. 1-16.

forego the right of taxing the colony and to accord its inhabitants free trade.

It is quite understandable that this was too much for Lord Goderich, despite his tentative acceptance of the project propounded in previous conferences. In their accompanying letter the petitioners stated that they wished

"as much as possible to give the body of settlers at large a voice in what concerns them specially; and for this purpose they propose keeping in view the instructions furnished by Sir Basil Keith, Governor of Jamaica, to Mr. Ferguson, as superintendent of the settlement of Honduras, in 1775." (1)

They were to learn the change which had come over the views of the Colonial Office since the year of grace 1775. The letter received (2)

(1) Colonel Torrens to Lord Goderich, July 9, 1832. Acc. and Pap. op.cit., App. p.2.

(2) R.W.Hay to R.Torrens, July 17, 1832, ibid. p.16. Among Lord Goderich's objections were the following:
 "that it would virtually transfer to this company the sovereignty of a vast unexplored territory, equal in extent to one of the most considerable kingdoms in Europe; that it would encroach upon the limits of the existing colonies of New South Wales and Western Australia; that it is proposed to throw open the settlement to foreigners, as well as to British subjects, in such a manner as at once to place them upon a complete equality; that the objects of the corporation are defined with such latitude of expression as to exclude no conceivable employment of their capital; that the actual investment of that capital, or any part of it, is not necessarily to precede the issuing of the charter; that the charter would invest the company with the power of legislation, and would even enable them to delegate to others the exercise of that trust, without taking the very least security against the possible abuse of so high an authority; that the company would enjoy the right of erecting courts, and of appointing and removing judges and other officers; that they claim the power of raising and commanding the militia; that they would exclude the King from the exercise of that power of imposing duties of customs which Parliament has entrusted to him, throughout the eastern colonies; that a freedom of trade is claimed, to which the Navigation and Trade Acts, as they now stand, are opposed; that all the powers of the company, extensive as they are, and involving in their practical effects the sovereign dominion of the whole territory, are ultimately to be transferred to a popular assembly, which would be to erect within the British monarchy a government purely republican; and that the company would be the receivers of large sums of public money, for the due application of which they do not propose to give any specific security."

in reply to their communication of the draft charter would have damped the ardour of any would-be colonizers but the Colonial Reformers. They realised that "a government purely republican" was the most objectionable of their proposals. Accordingly they reduced their suggestion to "the eventual privilege of a legislative assembly"⁽¹⁾. They made other concessions. The nature of the reply next received has been indicated: "their own opinions must be unsettled", "the grounds of the whole measure must have been very imperfectly explored", in brief their maturity of judgment was not such as to lead the Secretary of State to apprehend that any advantage would arise from continuing the correspondence.⁽²⁾ This was definite enough: exactly eleven months, and a change at the Colonial Office, occurred before the proposal was renewed.

In the interval, "England and America" was published. It was predominantly concerned with the economic principles of Wakefield. "The theorists of 1830" had realised that their pattern colony would have to attempt one thing at a time. Since material prosperity and a degree of civilisation must precede the establishment of colonial self-government they brought themselves to the relinquishing of the political aspect of the project in its entirety. The final section only of the new statement of the views of the school refers to "The Government of Colonies."⁽³⁾

(1) R.Torrens to Lord Goderich, July 19, 1832, Acc. and Pap. op.cit. pp.17, 18.

(2) R.W.Hay to R. Torrens, August 6, 1832, *ibid.* p.19.

(3) "England and America", II, pp.243-262.

The tone in which reference is made to the evils of the day in colonial administration is much bitter^{er} than in the "Letter from Sydney". This is natural considering the years of contention with the department which had intervened: it is none the less regrettable. Wakefield's gratuitous provocation of the Colonial Office weakened his immediate chances of effecting colonial reform. He lays it down as inevitable that a corrupt ministry should oppose such colonization as, bringing in its train colonial prosperity and and culture, would make it intelligent to see and strong to prevent misgovernment from a distance. ⁽¹⁾ "With the capacity for self-government comes the power to exercise it." The method at present pursued by which the colonists are kept in subjection, is, he asserts,

"by getting up hostile factions among them." "The machinery where-
"by misgovernment thus supports itself is, generally, a council in
"the colony, composed partly of strangers, partly of colonists, all
"named by the governor." (2)

Effective use is made of the evidence of Mr. Edward Ellice before the Canada Committee of 1828, in demonstrating, how, by excessive land grants, "some of the inhabitants of subject colonies are
bribed to lend their assistance in hurting the other inhabitants". ⁽³⁾

(1) "England and America", II, p.244.

(2) Ibid. p.246.

(3) See above p. 244, note (2). Cf. "Letter from Sydney", p.46
"The Government of all new countries exercise an imperceptible
despotism over the affairs of nearly all their subjects, by means
of their power over waste land". That wild lands become "a sort of
secret service fund", Wakefield stated to the Colonial Lands
Committee. Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.114, query No. 999.

An apt reference is that to Ireland as an example of misgovernment from a distance based on the support of a local faction.⁽¹⁾

Reviewing English colonial history he points out that the early rule was to concede local self-government.

"No sooner, however, did the English take possession of colonies which had been founded by other nations without any provision for local self-government, than the aristocracy of England found out the advantage of holding colonies in subjection." (2)

Now the entrenched defenders of that system "seek to deny, that the system of governing colonies from Downing Street is a modern innovation."

As he continues to show the advantages of local self-government for colonies, logic asserts itself increasing as compared with mere acerbity. Self-government would be better government for, as none would know so well the wants of the colonists as they would themselves, none would have such an interest in an efficient administration of their affairs. It would be cheaper government. The mother country would be relieved of the expense of the defence of a self-governing colony. While it is true that whether the colonists should be entrusted with the control of their own affairs or not depends in part on the character of those who found the settlement, it is equally and more significantly true that, assured of that privilege, a better type of colonist would be attracted.

"Magna virum mater!" exclaims Adam Smith, when he gives to England "the credit of having furnished the men fit to establish empires in America. But would those superior men have quitted England for that purpose, without a prospect of self-government?" (3)

(1) "England and America", II, p.248.

(2) Ibid. p.250.

(3) Ibid.p.253.

Concluding the argument here he shows that there is nothing in the nature of a colony which necessitates its being nourished in infancy on a monopoly of the mother country's market for its exportable produce; in fact that such a provision would hurt the colony quite as much as it has long since been shown to injure the country granting it.⁽¹⁾

The longer Wakefield studied colonization the more convinced he became that good government was essential. Writing to the South Australian Commissioners after the passing of the act which made it clear that the colony they were to administer would have something far less satisfactory than company management, very quickly leading to self-government^{as} at first proposed for it, this enthusiast, although himself excluded from any public share in the enterprise still pleads for some demonstration in advance of "the fundamental laws which are to exist". Without such being guaranteed in some measure he is convinced that the project cannot succeed.⁽²⁾ Events made him a true prophet. To the select committee on South Australia, 1841, he repeated the compromises and concessions which had been necessary to get any act whatsoever. "The most important sacrifice that was made was", he submitted, "that nothing like responsibility was created within the colony on the part of the local government: that there was no control of any sort among the colonists over the public expenditure."⁽³⁾

(1) "England and America", II, pp. 258-261.

(2) Acc. and Pap. 1841, IV, App. pp. 332-339. "If ever so rich a colony should depart, even with a sufficient prize for land, but with bad laws, or no laws, and bad leaders, the expedition will be a mere scramble, like that to the Swan River". (concluding sentence)

(3) Ibid. pp. 224, 225, query No. 2574.

Perhaps Wakefield's part in the entire thought output of the colonial reformers is nowhere better established than before the Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies. Especially is his position 'primus inter pares' enhanced if his evidence be read in conjunction with Lord Durham's Report. It will then appear that, among other major recommendations of that famous state paper, the demarcation of powers between mother country and colony was largely Wakefield's, particularly the reservation of the control of crown land in the colonies to the Imperial Government. Two points are made clear with regard to this much questioned reservation: first, that the colonial reformers had carefully considered, and were prepared to meet, the arguments against their position, and, second, that they fully understood that a stage in the development of each colony, would, in all probability occur which would necessitate the restoration of land management to a local authority.

Wakefield based his arguments for the centralization of the control of wild land throughout the empire on two necessities; the necessity for a uniform system of disposal and the necessity for the exact supply by the mother country of the labour market of each colony. (1) His interrogators in 1836 supposed a free legislature established in New South Wales. (2) Would that body, on Wakefield's broad argument for self-government that it was better informed, not be competent to manage its own land questions? Even

(1) Evidence before the Committee on the Disposal of Land in the British Colonies. Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.116, query No. 1018.

(2) It had already been promised by Sir G. Murray; see Molesworth's speech of March, 6, 1838. "Selected Speeches", pp. 27, 28.

to this he replied that since the interest was imperial the control, the highest executive, should be in London.⁽¹⁾ He made it clear that he would avail the Central Land Board of local knowledge in all possible ways.⁽²⁾ Subordinate boards in colonial centres should be entrusted with details of management, even with the determination of its lesser principles, where the interests of the mother country could not suffer by such delegation of authority. Questioned further as to the likelihood of the vital interest of the colonists, though comparatively few in number as compared with the empire's population, constituting a more perfect check on the administration of land than the half-interest of the majority in the distant mother country, he still maintained his position.⁽³⁾ Undue self-interest on the part of the colonists was exactly what he feared. The danger was that colonists on the spot would exploit the natural resources of their corner of the empire to the detriment of potential colonists in England or already on the high seas. With Ireland and its millions to provide for, there was no danger of Britain having other than sufficient interest in land disposal to ensure attention to its adequate administration. A central authority was as necessary to secure the smooth working of imperial colonization⁽⁴⁾ as of poor relief

(1) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, p.116, queries Nos. 819, 82.

(2) Ibid. query No. 1012.

(3) Ibid. query No. 1008.

(4) It will be remembered that he had established before the Committee that the three elements in colonization were waste land, emigration and capital: Britain would provide two of them.

(1)
 or postal services. He used the argument from the American system of central control with effect. He pointed out that the most remarkable feature of the government of the United States was the comparatively few functions exercised by the Federal authorities. State control of unappropriated land had been found totally unsatisfactory. Central administration had
 (2)
 proved the solution.

The reference to the United States is not an unimportant one. Wakefield, it has been pointed out, included the republic within his definition of a colony; to repeat, a country at once immigrating and emigrating. Then the United States was, in his view, an example of a colony completely competent to manage its own lands. That colonies would reach such a point, he conceded
 (3)
 as probable. It was his opinion that the mother country would be the best judge of the colony's having attained that stage of development. Up to that point, however, he insisted that the interests of empire, which would include the interests of any particular colony, required that land administration should be
 (4)
 an imperial function.

(1) Cf. evidence before Colonial Lands Committee, 1836, p.117, query No. 1018.

(2) Ibid. p.114, query No. 1002.

(3) This view of the colonial reformers explains what seems the inconsistency which Sir Charles Lucas finds in the Durham Report in that in one place willingness to hand over the public lands to the legislature of the united provinces of British North America, while elsewhere metropolitan control of wild lands alone was envisaged. To Wakefield a federal authority in Canada would approximate that of the United States and be acceptable as a land-controlling authority. Cf. Durham's Report, II, p.314 and note 2.

(4) To the 1836 Committee he stated, p.117, query No.1022, "Only by establishing a strong imperial interest do you establish the case for imperial control" of wild lands."

Between the lines of Wakefield's whole argument can be read his fear of corrupt use being made of a colonial land-granting department. He has more than a hint of the truth that "the function of authority most full of good or evil consequences has been the disposal of public land."⁽¹⁾ It is in his evidence before the 1836 Committee that he describes waste land in the colonies as "a sort of secret service fund". Between the tendency to jobbery and the great danger of ignorant and hurtful disposal, colonial administration was certain to fail, except in the very last stages of the development of a free colony. Referring in this connection to the decision which such a very young colony as that which was setting out for South Australia in a month's time would reach were the question of land disposal submitted to their judgment, he⁽²⁾ confesses the general lack of intelligence of the English labourer. The embryo colony would certainly insist that the land should be given away: their immediate interest as it seemed to them, would determine their finding. The illustration indicates his fear generally of the hurtful effect of prejudice of immediate self-interest would occasion were land disposed of by colonial enactments. His reference has its value, too, in indicating from yet another angle Wakefield's views on colonial government. He was not⁽³⁾ an unqualified democrat. The government designed for South

(1) Durham's Report, II, p.206.

(2) Acc. and Pap. 1836, XI, 512, query No. 827.

(3) Nor were the Colonial Reformers generally. Sir William Molesworth, M.P. approximates to that extreme position more nearly than any other of the Philosophical Radicals ordinarily grouped as exponents of Systematic Colonization. See his refutation in advance of the charge that his motion in criticism of Lord Glenelg's colonial administration had "democratic objects and tendencies". "Selected Speeches", (Ed. by Egerton) 1903, pp.12, 13, (March 6, 1838.)

Australia was not, as the Under Secretary for the Colonies described it, "a government purely republican."⁽¹⁾ The Colonial Reformers, among whom Lord Durham is ranked, consistently planned the attraction of the higher orders to the colonies. From their presence they anticipated a stabilising aristocratical influence which would make colonial self-government approximate⁽²⁾ in its practical results, the monarchical principle in Britain.

Wakefield's criticism of the evils of Colonial Office government of the colonies has been alluded to incidentally. Charles Buller in his "Responsible Government for Colonies" gathered it up into two short but telling chapters. His treatment of the subject is characterised by sympathetic consideration for the permanent officials, to no small extent the victims of the system: the justice he does them lends weight to his argument for justice to the colonists.

He prefaces his exposé of the bureaucracy of the department by showing that the legislature had abandoned its proper function in colonial government. On rare occasions only did it enact positive measures for the colonies. Too often, when such necessity did occur, the spirit of party entered to defeat the legitimate ends of legislation. Public apathy and legislative indifference, he maintains, are minor evils compared with the travesty of justice which results from allowing colonial affairs to become the

(1) See above page 381, note (2).

(2) Wakefield before the Colonial Lands Committee, query No. 327.

sport of domestic factions. In the main, legislative functions had been delegated to "the Office". But no provision had been made for subjecting departmental measures to the scrutiny and the verdict of public opinion. He cites the large powers of the poor law commissioners as proof that justice could be attained by such administrative enactments when made in the full light of publicity.⁽¹⁾ Parliament, however, is indifferent to colonial questions. "In nine cases out of ten it merely registers the edicts of the Colonial Office in Downing Street."⁽²⁾

The consequence is that an appeal to the mother country resolves itself into an appeal to Mr. Mother-Country, as Buller denominates the unknown and unknowable irresponsible clerk, whose knowledge of local details makes him the final arbiter no matter how well-intentioned and generally capable his ultimate superior, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, may be. The impossibility of that frequently changing minister becoming acquainted with all the colonies to the extent of judging for himself on the merits or demerits of a particular case is made obvious. He may rebel against the abnegation of his own judgment: the system coerces him: the underling's routine familiarity determines the policy for one

(1) "In every other department of the State the minister is responsible to this House, when the representatives of conflicting interests have the strongest motives to keep anxious and vigilant watch over the details of his conduct, and unnecessary delay and inactivity are exposed to constant reproach". Sir William Molesworth "Select Speeches", p.17.

(2) "Responsible Government for Colonies", pp. 73, 74.

secretary, and, 'ipso facto', consolidates his power to decide for the succeeding secretary. That there are advantages to be found in "entrusting absolute power (for such it is) to one wholly irresponsible" ⁽¹⁾ Buller conceded. It ensures a certain degree of consistency in policy.

Mr. Mother-Country's rule is better than that of constantly shifting Secretaries and Under Secretaries; yet it is at best a most unfortunate system. Assiduity gives the permanent official "a very complete knowledge of very immaterial incidents" ⁽²⁾ in colonial affairs, the small dust of controversial questions. At the same time he remains ignorant of the broad issues which vitally affect the majority of the inhabitants of the colony of which he knows the subjects in dispute best. Unaccustomed to render an account of his stewardship, the irresponsible reduces his task to the merest routine, acquires an intense jealousy of encroachment on his power, and generates an unthinking hatred of innovation. His fear of parliamentary inquiry renders him the prey of the not overly scrupulous custodians of party influence. Vested interests single him out for their more subtle manipulation.

(1) Buller, op.cit. p.81.

(2) Ibid. p.85. "Thus, while the question of contending races was gradually breaking up the whole social system of Lower Canada, Mr. Mother-Country, unconscious of the mischief, thought that he was restoring order and satisfaction by well-reasoned despatches on points of prerogative and precedent".

"While these narrow views and partial interests have their active organs, the colonial public and the interests of the colony have rarely any, never equally efficient representatives".

Buller's delineation of the evils of colonial appointments, "jobs which even parliamentary rapacity would blush to ask from the Treasury", is too familiar to repeat. The most potent secret influence which plays upon the susceptible official is that of the governor's clique in the colony. Such "acquire a strength (1) which makes them very formidable to Mr. Mother-Country". As "the Porte never interferes except to make matters worse", so with the Downing Street irresponsible.

"His ignorance of the real state of affairs in the colony, his habits of routine, his dependence on the secret cliques and interests at home, produce an invariable tendency on his part to stave off the decision of every question referred to him."

The matter is referred back to the governor; each tries to avoid the responsibility of deciding. Irrelevant and apparently purposeless correspondence is reduced to a fine art. In the end the affair is spun out "until it either evaporates into something absolutely insignificant, or until the patience and interest of all parties concerned are entirely worn out." (2) Should the colonist bring his suit home, deferred hopes and "the Sighing Rooms" of "the Office at War with all the Colonies" (3) collaborate to bring him to abandon his object in despair.

(1) Buller, op.cit. p.91.

(2) Buller, op.cit. p.92. Hence "a style peculiar to colonial despatches; a style in which the words of the English language are used with a very admirable grace and facility, but at the same time an utter absence of meaning". Cf. "Art of Colonization", p.246.

(3) Lord Derby's phrase. Cf. William Parr Greswell, "The Growth and Administration of the British Colonies 1837-1897", 1898, p.16.

(1)

A year and a half before Buller's article first appeared Sir William Molesworth in a most effective speech in the House of Commons forced home the crying evils of colonial administration under Lord Glenelg. The speaker's reputation for having a thorough grip of his facts lost nothing from his attempt of the evening of March 6, 1838 to show up the failure of the noble lord, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. His directness and honesty convinced his hearers that his motion of lack of confidence in a member of the ministry was actuated, even to the extent of departing from precedent, by motives above both personal animosity and party machination. He succeeded in presenting a graphic picture of "the imbecile and mischievous administration" of colonial affairs. In addition he made it patent that the system of irresponsibility in vogue, and the multiplicity of duties thrust upon the Department of State for the Colonies, would, if the policy of drift were continued, perpetuate the evils he indicated.

He spoke as a thorough Wakefieldian. Reviewing the advantages of colonization as furnishing markets, refuting Bentham and Parnell's assertion that "independent States" were a profitable to Britain as colonies, pointing out the error of those who "have imagined that colonies and jobbing, colonial trade and colonial

(4) (from previous page) Buller, op.cit. pp.94-96. This inimitable description cannot fail to suggest Dickens' treatment twelve years later, of the "Circumlocution Office".

(1) December, January and February, 1839-40, in the Colonial Gazette.

(2) "Selected Speeches", pp. 3, 4.

monopoly were synonymous terms", he used Wakefield's arguments and his language.⁽¹⁾
⁽²⁾ His explanation of the growth of separatist tendencies was well put.

"A new dislike to the old system of colonial trade, and an impression made by the new system of colonial government, under which the evils and abuses, necessarily belonging to all governments from a distance, had increased and become more obvious — these I believe to be at the bottom of the opinion, which condemns as mischievous and absurd the old fashioned, but (as it appears to me) sound opinion which is expressed by the cry "Ships, colonies, and commerce." (3)

The major premise of the syllogism, which was to prove Glenelg incompetent for the duties involved by his position, was that the Colonial Office required a man of "diligence, forethought, judgment, activity and firmness."⁽⁴⁾ Sir William Molesworth made this clear by showing the difficulties of the department. In addition to having to administer colonies the world over, "an administration

(1) "Select Speeches", pp. 6, 7, 8.

(2) This is strikingly true. The discernment of the patriarch is not necessary to appreciate that though the hands be those of Molesworth, Buller or Durham (to mention no others) the voice is the voice of Wakefield. Two incidental references made in this speech on Glenelg's Colonial Administration suggest the carrying power, the ubiquity, of Wakefield's thought. One lies in the speaker's quotation (page 4) from the public announcement of the revived Colonization Society (1837-1844). It is almost verbatim a passage from Wakefield's evidence before the Colonial Lands Committee. Cf. page 328 note (1). The other is found in the reference to a Colonial Office paper of January 1836 which recommended setting a price on wild lands in the West Indies with a view to restricting squatting and idleness when the negroes should be fully emancipated. (pp. 41-44). It was a pamphlet of Wakefield's paraphrased.

(3) "Selected Speeches", p. 11.

(4) Ibid. p. 49.

more varied and difficult than that of this country, of one race, language and law", the department had to legislate more or less for all the colonies, and altogether for some of them. The minister in charge was less likely to receive assistance from his colleagues than was any other minister.

"If Parliament will not alter the system which imposes so much upon one person — which gives to that person so great a power for good or evil, it is at least the duty of Parliament to take care that that office is not filled by one of the most incompetent members of the Government." (1)

That the Colonial Secretary was not possessed of such qualifications was shown by shrewd scrutiny of the state of affairs obtaining in the colonies. Six governors had just been recalled: the two, whose conduct merited that treatment, had been appointed by the Secretary in question. Sir William Molesworth began with Australia. He indicated that three outstanding problems there had been entirely neglected by the noble lord, the crying evils of convictism, the clamant demand for hired labour, and the need

(1) "Selected Speeches", p.18.

(2) Sir Richard Bourke, Sir Benjamin D'Urban, Major Henry Campbell, Captain Hindmarsh, Lord Gosford and Sir Francis Bond Head, "six gentlemen at least who have cause to rue the day when they became subordinates of Lord Glenelg". Ibid. p.40.

(3) Sir William Molesworth had gone to Lord John Russell, the Home Secretary for assurance of support before moving for a committee on transportation. Ibid. p.23. Similarly H.G.Ward M.P. had acted "as if in truth there were no such minister as the noble lord at the head of the Colonial Office" when arranging for the Colonial Lands Committee. Ibid. p.26.

(4) The Howick Regulations, as Molesworth calls them, had yielded £400,000 from land sales in the two old colonies in Australasia. Part of it had been expended by irresponsible parties, first, the London Emigration Committee, then an emigration broker, John Marshall. The emigrants 'selected' were of a most undesirable type. Cf. Wakefield's evidence before the Colonial Lands Committee, 1836, query No. 926; "Selected Speeches" p.24. The remainder was "locked up in the public chest at Sydney, lying idle". Ibid. p.25.

of some measure of self-government in New South Wales, free settlers having for some time constituted the majority and the old act having expired. In New Zealand even the preservation of the Maoris, a cause Lord Glenelg was supposed to have particularly at heart, failed to stimulate him to action. So the indictment proceeded; Mauritius, the Cape, Sierra Leone, the "apprentice colonies" in the West Indies, the Canadas. It is best summarised in the words of the speaker, who, in the truth of his proposition and the expediency of affirming it, found justification for his action beyond the need of records of similar motives in the past.

"Sir, instead of searching after precedents, I point to the millions of our fellow-subjects who are unrepresented in this House; to the great branches of domestic industry which depend upon the well-being of our colonial empire; to New South Wales sinking into a state of irreclaimable depravity, with its free emigration fund locked up in the Government chest, and its oft-promised Constitution withheld year after year; to the Mauritius, with its 20,000 freemen held in bondage by the insolent and would-be rebel planters to South Africa, almost denuded of its native inhabitants, distracted by factions who agree in nothing but their curses of the Colonial Office, and its horde of rebels gone forth into the wilderness to conquer an inheritance of oppression over the helpless natives; to the "white man's grave", that job of jobs, which is rejoicing in the recall of a reforming Governor; to the West Indies ---- inventing a new slave trade with the sanction of the noble lord, in order to counteract the noble lord's total neglect of the means which he himself has pointed out as necessary to preserve the use of capital in those fertile lands;----- and lastly to the North American provinces, where open revolt has just been suppressed, where civil bloodshed has excited the passions of hatred and revenge, where a Constitution is suspended, and martial law is still in force, and where there is no prospect of peace and contented allegiance, but in the prompt settlement of a great variety of questions of surpassing complexity and difficulty." (1)

(1) "Selected Speeches", pp. 50, 51.

That Lord Glenelg's qualities were not those outstanding as ones requisite in a Colonial Secretary was amply proven. An address to Her Majesty to the effect that the Secretary of State for the Colonies did not enjoy the confidence of the House was moved by the speaker. The motion was lost, but not the effect of the speech of Sir William Molesworth in introducing it. Ministers protested against the unconstitutionality of a vote of censure on one member of the cabinet; but, according to C. G. Greville, they "turned out" the colleague whose incompetence had been so convincingly demonstrated. In destructive criticism the colonial reformers had a part to play: in the main their contribution was constructive.

The Durham Report opens a new chapter in Imperial history. It is a study in itself. At the same time it has been regarded, perhaps unduly, in isolation from the political theories of Wakefield as elsewhere developed. The reasons for such treatment of the recommendations of the High Commissioner are several. The moral and social snobbery which denied Wakefield an official place with his pupils in the investigation of affairs in the Canadas long clouded his reputation: what it denied him, for identical reasons, it ascribed to Lord Durham. Again Wakefield's name had already acquired an association with economic theories, with systematic colonization as a means of providing for free emigration by the sale of wild lands especially in Australia. The High Commissioner's acknowledgments of his assistance were discounted as the magnanimous self-depreciation of the gentleman

(1)
 that he was, or were interpreted as synonymous with the definite assignment to Wakefield by Buller of the credit for the Crown Lands Appendix. (2)
 Wakefield's success as an exponent of a new theory of colonial land control both in the decade preceding the report, and in the report itself, militated against the due recognition of the part he played in shaping its political recommendations. In part, too, the general public had had an inadequate opportunity of appreciating his ideas on colonial government. As has been indicated they were but sketchily outlined in his first major work, while the second, "England and America", professedly concentrated on the social and economic aspects of colonization. If the blue books which contain his evidence before Parliamentary Select Committees, (3) and still more that which he prepared for others to tender, (4) had been diligently studied by an earlier generation of students, Wakefield's place with Lord Durham as the joint author of the recommendation of self-government for the Canadas has long since been placed beyond cavil.

To analyse the report so as to demonstrate this is beyond the purview of the present study. In broad outline the first proof

(1) Hansard, 1839, 3rd. Series, XLIX, 878.

(2) Ibid. 503.

(3) Especially the Colonial Lands Committee, 1836, the New Zealand Committee, 1840, and the South Australia Committee, 1841.

(4) E.g. R.D.Hanson's evidence before H.G.Ward's Committee, 1836; "The Abstract or Description of certain Powers granted by the Government of England to Individuals or Bodies Corporate for the foundation and government of Colonies" furnished with a proposed Charter for the South Australian Commission, February 21, 1834. Acc. and Pap. 1841, IV, App. pp.23-26.

of Wakefield's basic influence would be found in the light which a full and comprehensive knowledge of his views would throw on some of the seeming inconsistencies of the solution offered by the High Commissioner. The reservation of crown lands for imperial control is one of these. ⁽¹⁾ In details ⁽²⁾ as well as in principles, the genetic treatment of the political ideas of the Colonial Reformers would serve to illuminate ^{the} obscurities which appear even in this masterly state paper. Compared with the demonstration of Wakefield's part which such research would furnish, the case that can on other grounds be made out for his material contributions is a thing of shreds and patches.

Dr. Garnett cites a book "given to Wakefield by Lord Durham, with an inscription testifying that he had never erred except when he ~~had~~ rejected Wakefield's advice." ⁽³⁾ The latter had become quite accustomed to the omission of his name from boards of directors, and to his being passed over when colonial appointments were made: but when a despatch from Lord Durham to Lord Glenelg

(1) See above page 386.

(2) Cf. p.388, note (3). Sir Charles Lucas indicates the error of both Lord Durham and Charles Buller regarding "the Alien Law, which was passed shortly after the last war with the United States". Report, II, p.172 footnote. That such a law was passed is the impression left on the mind of the reader of Robert Gourlay's "Statistical Account of Upper Canada" which chapter IX above shows that Wakefield used extensively. It seems perfectly plausible to hold that Wakefield simply passed the misconception on to Durham and Buller. A great deal could be made of Gourlay's influence on Wakefield's ideas of political questions, the feasibility of confederation, the stress on English as apposed to French interests, the importance of municipal institutions, roads and canals, the need of a Canadian court of appeal. See Appendix III.

(3) "Edward Gibbon Wakefield", p.170.

in which Wakefield's part in the Canada commission "was to some extent described", was "'mislaide' by the Colonial Office" he could not refrain from commenting upon the inadvertence. ⁽¹⁾ In this connection John Stuart Mill's reference to the plainness with which Buller and Wakefield tendered Lord Durham advice might be mentioned. ⁽²⁾ Buller's statement that the High Commissioner had completely entered into all Wakefield's views of colonies and emigration ⁽³⁾ may fairly be interpreted in the broader sense which includes Wakefield's ideas of colonial government; for there is no doubt that Buller himself was Wakefield's pupil in that respect as well as in the principles of land sale and assisted emigration. Internal evidence, alone, will prove Wakefield's real part in the report. It will yet be interpreted in the light of Wakefield's life-work for colonies, quite away from cavilling personalities, and with allowance for, but not antipathy on account of, his unfortunate increasing rancour towards the Colonial Office.

Such a comprehensive survey will include Wakefield's subsequent writings. ⁽⁴⁾ Buller's "Responsible Government for Colonies" will be shown as a brilliant illuminating corollary to the famous report. Justice to Lord Durham will not deny Edward

(1) "Art of Colonization", pp. 51, 52.

(2) To Sir William Molesworth, October 19, 1838, quoted in Mrs. Fawcett's "Life of Sir William Molesworth", p.203.

(3) "Sketch of Lord Durham's Mission", Durham Report, III, p.351.

(4) In particular "A View of Sir Charles Metcalfe's Government in Canada", 1844, and an article in "Fisher's Colonial Magazine" of that year, "Sir Charles Metcalfe in Canada".

Gibbon Wakefield the premier place among colonial reformers. He will be given that substantial position which Lord Lytton's words of him indicate,

"the man in these latter days beyond comparison of the most genius and widest influence in the great science of colonization, both as a thinker, a writer, and a worker; whose name is like a spell to all interested in that subject." (1)

The English people, like their Waterloo hero, were "rich in saving common sense." What was for a little concealed from the wise and prudent was after all a simple thing — that colonies should be allowed administrative freedom commensurate with the legislative freedom already enjoyed. It came about in the English way, without enactment, even without explicit instructions. It transpired in the adjustment of definite tangible relations between governor and legislature. It was accepted at home, if a public journal of the day be reliable, ⁽²⁾ even before it was implemented in the Canadas. At first, it is true, indeed for a considerable time by some, colonial self-government was regarded as affording (to quote Professor Egerton) "a welcome euthanasia of the Imperial connection." ⁽³⁾ But this was the view of a faction to whom economic laissez-faire, free trade derived from first principles, and destined to prevail universally, was everything: it

(1) Edward Jerningham, ^{Wakefield,} op.cit, Introduction by Sir Robert Stout, p.I. Cf. Lord Norton's letter to Wakefield's biographer, Garnett, pp. XVIII, XIX.

(2) Edinburgh Review, April 1847, p.366, "---the only point connected with the subject which at all perplexes any one is, how it should have been necessary to send so eminent a man across the Atlantic to discover that the colonies could not be well governed under any other system."

(3) Introduction to Molesworth's "Selected Speeches", p.IX.

was not the view of the English middle class. Utilitarianism and the classical economists influenced a handful: the spirit of the Reform Bill of 1832, reincarnate in the Report of 1839, was kin to more emotional human qualities, than such speculative reasoning. It has been well said by Lord Bryce that "Rousseau fired a thousand, for one Bentham convinced"⁽¹⁾. The same ratio obtained in regard to the appraisal by Englishmen of local self-government for British colonies: for one who rejoiced that burdensome dependents would find an occasion to "loose the bond, and go", a thousand conceded, as Briton to fellow-Briton, that it was theirs of right. 1832 had dwarfed 1783 into insignificance.

By the end of the period with which this study has been concerned public opinion has assumed a definite role in the shaping of colonial policy. Great progress had been made in the enlightenment of the nation. Colonial affairs had acquired a permanent place in newspaper and magazine. Even the novelists had begun to invest Australian and Canadian scenes with the glamour of romance. Their heroines were no longer, exclusively, the heiresses of West Indian planters. But the later years of the period had forged stronger links. The migration of Britons had made each colony 'home'. Colonial news was no longer a flimsy broad sheet, months old at the best. The news that mattered ^{was} now a family letter. The bonds that counted had become essentially human.

When the period opened Pitt was considering the suggestion of one, John Palmer, the lessee of the Bath Theatre, that the post-boy

(1) "Modern Democracies", 1921, p.51.

should give place to the stage-coach for the conveyance of letters. The proposal was adopted in 1784. When the period closed, Samuel Cunard had just signed the contract which first put Royal Mail Steamships on a fortnightly trans-Atlantic service. But there is a danger in such juxtaposition of facts. It is easy to exaggerate the progress in British colonial history between the recognition of American Independence and the Durham report. The antidote lies in realising that the years between are really fewer than they seem. The human factor has come so strongly into the fore-ground that perhaps the correction of this illusion cannot be made better than in the terms of a human life. The widow of Captain James Cook was forty-one years of age when the period in question opened. She lived to within four years of its close.

The span of half a life-time does not witness a fundamental change in the character of a people, even when it covers such a world movement as the French Revolution. There is more identity than there appears to be between the relation existing between Public Opinion and Colonial Policy in 1783, and 1839.

-----ooOoo-----

A P P E N D I X I.

DISCUSSION OF PETITIONS AND COUNTER PETITIONS re CHANGE OF
GOVERNMENT IN CANADA. (1)

concludes:

"In forming a decision on points of so much importance, & extent, it is undoubtedly material, that they should be examined, in a more enlarged, & general point of view, &, that it should be considered, by what means, the connection, & dependance of Canada, on this Country, may be so preserved, & cultivated, as to be render'd most beneficial to Great Britain, during its continuance, & most permanent in its duration.

"In this view, a doubt may naturally suggest itself, both from an opinion, which seems to be pretty generally received, & from an observation of the late events in America, whether the degree of freedom, which, the measure now proposed would give to the Canadians, is not inconsistent with the existence of a dependant Government.

"It may perhaps, be justly doubted, whether any form of Administration which could now be established, would prevent the separation of so great, & distant a dominion, after it should have arrived at a certain point of extension, & improvement.

"But the real question now to be decided is, what system is best calculated to remove this event to a distant period & to render the connection, in the interval, advantageous to the Mother Country without oppression or injury to the Colony?

"It is certainly very material to examine the constitution of our former Colonies with a view to this Question; in order that we may profit by our experience there, & avoid, if possible in the Government of Canada, those defects which hastened the independence of our antient possessions in America. And the result of such an enquiry will perhaps shew, that the revolt of those provinces is not justly to be ascribed to a communication of the British Constitution, which, in fact they never enjoyed; but that, as their form of Government differed essentially from that of Great Britain, so the points in which that difference consisted, were those which operated most to produce their

(1) Canadian Archives, C. O.42. vol. 21, p.55.
This was enclosed by Grenville to Dorchester, October 20, 1789.
It is without date or signature. Sessional Paper, op.cit.,
pp. 920 note, 982 - 987.

separation from the Mother Country, & which are avoided in the plan now suggested for the Constitution of Canada.

"Such an examination does indeed assume a point which is liable to be much questioned, & which it would perhaps be very difficult to maintain by any grounds of general reasoning or speculation. The Establishment of a separate & local Legislature in a distant province, under any form or model which can be adopted for the purpose, leads so evidently to habitual Notions of a distinct interest, & to the existence of a virtual independence as to many of the most important points of Government, that it seems naturally to prepare the way for an entire separation, whenever other circumstances shall bring it forward. If therefore the subject were entirely new, & if the preservation of the dependance of a colony on its Mother Country were the only object to be considered, it should seem that this would best be attained by reserving at home the whole right & exercise of the power of Legislation; and that this System, tho' certainly less adapted to promote the prosperity of the province would probably be effectual to maintain for a considerable time, the union of the Empire.

"But it has happened, either from accident or necessity, that a different principle has been adopted, in the formation of all the British Colonies, & even in the constitution which has already been given to Canada. We have established there, tho' in a different manner, from what was done in the other Colonies, a distant local Legislature, competent to all the powers of Government, except Taxation. And this last power, which, by the Quebec Bill, we had reserved to the British Parliament, we have since been compelled by our own formal declaration in 17(78) & perhaps still more by the circumstances of the present times, to relinquish & abandon.

"Taking it then for granted that some Legislature must exist in Canada, for the exercise of those functions which are now vested in the Legislative Council, and for the purpose of Taxation, the necessity of which has before been stated, it remains to compare the plan which is now proposed for Canada, with the Constitution of the antient Colonies.

"It will appear, on such examination, that in the formation of those Governments, while full Scope & Vigour were given to the principles of Democracy by the establishment of a popular representation, in their houses of Assembly, no care was taken to preserve a due mixture of the Monarchical, & Aristocratical parts of the British Constitution.

"The defects in the formation of the second branch of those Legislatures, or of the Council, as it was called, have already been mentioned, in the discussion of one of the points of the petitions.

"Those in the constitution, & administration of the executive Government, were scarcely less glaring, & had, unquestionably

them
 a powerful operation, in producing the defection of the Colonies. The situation of those Counties, removed from the seat and residence of the Royal Authority. Whatever effect arises, here, from the immediate presence of the Sovereign, or from the influence of His Court, was therefore, necessarily lost, at so great a distance from the Mother Country.

"The nature of the Situation allotted to the Governors in America, the limited extent of their Authority, the dependance, in which they frequently found themselves, on the Colonies even for their own support, & Maintenance, the little consequence annexed to their Station, &, sometimes, the character, & rank of the persons sent there, were but ill adapted to remedy the defect arising from the absence of the Sovereign.

"In addition to these considerations, the power of conferring honours, and emoluments, enables the Sovereign, in this country, to animate the exertions of individuals, & to secure their attachment to the existing form of Government, by all the fair objects, of just, & honourable ambition.

"The case was widely different in the Colonies. The rewards of the Crown were few; they were such, as conferred little distinction; & they were, perhaps sometimes bestowed, with a very small degree of attention to the principle which has here been stated.

"If these defects could, at all, be remedied by an attention to those causes, in which they have originated, there might be just reason to hope, that the consequences would be different.

"With respect to the first point, much has already been done.

"The consolidating the different Governments, in the remaining Colonies under one person, must operate to give weight, & dignity, to the representation of the executive authority.

"The Union of the Supreme Civil & Military Power, in the same hands, is a measure of a similar tendency, and effect; and it appears reasonable to hope, that the footing, on which that situation is now placed, in point of consideration, & emolument will give as much security, as the nature of the thing itself will allow, for its continuing to be filled, in a proper, & adequate manner, & that it is already rendered so far independent of the different Colonies, over whom the Governor-General presides, that no diminution of dignity, or weight to the executive authority will arise on this account.

"The second point, which relates to the distribution of the favours, & rewards of the Crown, is attended with greater difficulty, on account of the limited extent of these objects, in the Government of a Colony, which is yet in its infancy.

"Something of this sort will however, arise, from the measure which has before been mentioned, with a different view, of conferring on the persons, who may be called to the Upper House of the Legislature, some personal, or hereditary distinction of Honour & Nobility.

"The establishment of a Military force, within the province, in the nature of a Militia, is a measure, which has already been adopted on the recommendation of Lord Dorchester; & the ideas stated by him on the subject, have the object of rendering the Commissions, in this establishment, the means of preventing the Canadian Noblesse, from serving in the French Army, as is now, too frequently the case.

"Other Objects of this nature will, by degrees, arise, as the consequence of the Colony itself increases, & as the detail of its Government becomes gradually more enlarged; and the Act which has been passed in the British Parliament, for enforcing the residence of persons, appointed to Provincial Offices, has an evident tendency to produce, in no inconsiderable degree, the object here desired, of having constantly, within the provinces a certain number of persons, attached by these means, to the existing form of Government, & to the connection with the Mother Country.

"There is another point of obvious, & striking difference between the Constitution of the former Colonies, & that of this Kingdom, and it is, in some degree, connected with this part of the subject.

"In Great Britain, & in Ireland, altho' it is necessary to have recourse to Parliament, for the support, & maintenance of the military force, yet, for the purposes of his Civil Government, the King possesses a large, hereditary Revenue; and this, altho' it is here given up, by a temporary exchange for the Civil List, is considered as a subsisting fund, and revives, at every demise of the Crown, so as to be applicable to the Expences of the Civil Government.

"In America, nothing of this sort has been established; The expences of Government, there, have, either been borne by this Country, or they have been defrayed by Taxes, imposed by the Provincial Legislatures.

"In either case, they would naturally, be inadequately provided for. The Government of this Country could not but feel a just reluctance to add to the burthens of the people of Great Britain, on account of objects, so remote to their interests, or feelings; while; on the other hand, the Colonists would naturally be very slow, in imposing taxes, on their own Agriculture, Commerce or Consumption, for the purpose of maintaining establishments in which they were hardly allowed to share, or of adding to the number of Civil Officers, absent from the duties of their Stations.

"The effect was not confined to the mere want of Patronage or rewards for services; it had a general tendency to diminish the weight, & consequences of Government itself, when the duties which all Government owes to those who are governed, were either not performed at all, from the want of proper office(r)s for the purpose, or were performed by persons, whose situation in life did not entitle them to the respect, or confidence of their Fellow-Citizens.

"It is certainly difficult, to propose a remedy for this evil, which may however, perhaps appear, not so much one, actually existing in Canada, as one, which may probably arise, if the expected increase of wealth, & population there, should not bring with it, an increase of resources, for the maintenance of a more extensive System of Government.

"No additional expence to Great Britain, on this account, can, or ought to be proposed: and the difficulties, which prevented the levying a sufficient revenue, for the purposes of Government, in the American Atlantic provinces, are likely to operate, with quite as much force, in that of Canada.

"There is certainly great reason to regret, that this object has hitherto been overlooked, in the first establishment of all our Colonies: because, at that period, it would have been easy to have secured this point, by measures, similar to those which are said to have been adopted by Penn, in the original Settlement of Pennsylvania; who, by reserving to himself, & to his heirs, a certain portion of Land, situated in the middle of every grant made to individuals, secured a property, which could not but increase, in value, in proportion to the increase of the Colony itself.

"This gradual & proportionate rise in the value of such reservations, without any expence to be bestowed upon them, renders this mode peculiarly adapted to the object which has been spoken of, above; because, it would thus evidently afford a resource increasing with the occasion of the demand which it is calculated to answer. Perhaps it is not too late, even now, for the adoption of such a system; There are, even in Lower Canada, large tracts, still ungranted, which, any increase in the population of the province, must render valuable from their situation, without requiring any expence of clearing, or cultivation to be bestowed upon them by the Crown; and, in Upper Canada, the Cultivation may be said to be still in its infancy, even on the banks of the Waters along which it spreads. The inner Countries have not been attempted to be settled, in either district of the province; and this measure of a reservation to be made in all future Grants, is recommended by Lord Dorchester, in one of his Letters, tho' as it appears, rather with a view of retaining the power of rewarding individuals, than with that of securing a revenue to the Crown, for the purposes of the Provincial Government.

"These are the several ideas which have occurred, on a consideration of this subject, as holding out the best grounds of establishing, in Canada, a form of Government well adapted to promote the prosperity of that province, & free from the errors which have prevail'd in the Constitution of the antient Colonies.

"And, if they can, in any sufficient degree, be carried into Effect, it may perhaps be thought that they would afford a juster, & more effectual security against the growth of a republican or independent spirit, than any which could be derived from a Government more arbitrary in its form or principles.

"But even if the advantages which appear to result from these measures were visionary & chimerical & if it were agreed that the danger of separation would be increased by giving to Canada a Constitution, assimilated, as is here proposed, to that of Great Britain, it may still be asked, whether this Plan is not become a point of almost inevitable necessity.

"The neighbourhood of the American States, & even of the remaining British Colonies seems to make it impossible that the people of Canada should acquiesce, for any considerable length of time, in the continuance of a system at all resembling that under which they are now governed.

"The discontents which have already arisen there on this subject, have now brought the question forward to the public view: If, in the discussions which will arise upon it, in the next Session of Parliament, the present form of Government in Canada is to be supported, it can be done only by speaking out, & avowing fairly, that the Object is, to retain the dependance of the province, by establishing, in it, a Constitution less free, than that which existed in the antient Colonies, or than that, which has been established, in those provinces, which still remain to Great Britain.

"And, considering the general temper of the present moment, it may well be doubted, whether it would be possible to maintain with success (supposing even, that it were desirable to do so) either that these means are well calculated for attaining the object in question, or, that the object itself ought to be aimed at, by denying, to so large a body of British Subjects, the benefits of the British Constitution; particularly, in those points which are considered so essential as those which are here in question."

A P P E N D I X II.

SOCIETIES, DEVOTED, IN A GREATER OR LESS DEGREE, TO THE
COLOURED TRIBES.

Date of Foundation.		1838 Income.
1696	The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.	118,500
1701	The Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts.	106,149
1732	The Missions of the Church of the United Brethren.	12,545
1783	The Anti-Slavery Society of the Friends in London.	
1785	The Wesleyan Methodist Missions.	
1787	The Slavery Abolition Committee.	
1788	The African Association.	
1792	The Baptists Missionary Society.	15,709
	The Sierra Leone Company.	
1794	The Society for Converting the Negroes in the West Indies.	
1795	The London Missionary Society.	71,355
1796	The Scottish Missionary Society.	3,175
	The General Assembly's Foreign Missions.	4,312
1797	The Glasgow Missionary Society.	
1799	The Tract Society.	67,775
1800	The Church Missionary Society	84,000
1802	Cape of Good Hope Missionary Society.	
1805	The British and Foreign Bible Society.	129,000

Date of Foundation.		1838 Income.
1812	The African Institution.	
1815	The Wesleyan Missionary Society.	81,735
1816	The General Baptist Society.	
1823	The Anti-Slavery Society.	
1831	The Asiatic Translation Society.	
1835	The Branches of the South Australian Colony, for the Instruction of the Natives.	
1836	The Aborigines Protection Society.	
1837	The Central Negro Emancipation Society.	
1837	The New Zealand Association.	
1838	The Society for Securing Redress of Colonial Grievances in Individual Cases.	

Adapted from Bannister, "British Colonization and Coloured
Tribes", 1838, pp.169, 170, 171.

-----ooOoo-----

APPENDIX III.

COLONIAL GOVERNMENT. (1)

On this subject I shall address myself to the People of England.

Since the United States made good their independence by the sword, North American Colonies must have cost us little less than fifty millions of pounds sterling; and I question if they have returned so many farthings for our governmental care. Till of late the annual charge could not be much less than half a million; and this fact I shall maintain, that instead of throwing away money on these colonies, we may draw from them a considerable revenue, merely by the economical distribution of waste lands. At the present time, when the bonds of society are ready to burst with over-strained taxation, surely such a consideration ought not to be thought a trifling one.

Our North American colonies are not yet ripe for independence or that should be granted them; - not independence of the crown, but of ministers. The colonies stand in need of kind nursing for ten years to come; at the end of which period they might be allowed to meet in Convention, and choose a government for themselves. It is their interest to remain for ever connected with this country, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose that they would ever harbour a wish to throw off its sovereignty, or deny us the right of disposing of waste lands to the best advantage. Set free from the wretched controul of haughty, ignorant, and capricious governors, they would most assuredly cherish a pride in their affinity to the parent state; they would remain for ever our friends, and fellow subjects. Were a liberal system of government established in the Colonies, liberal-minded men would spring up there; and, thither, liberal-minded men would emigrate from Britain. It is from liberality alone that Britain can retain and derive benefit from her colonies. Let us then at once have liberality.

Looking back to the history of America, how simple do the means appear by which we might have retained the United States. Good heavens! what madness was it to drive free-born Americans to rebellion by denying them the rights of men! What folly to

(1) Robert Fleming Gourlay, "Statistical Account of Upper Canada compiled with a view to a Grand System of Emigration in connection with a Reform of the Poor Laws." 3 vols. 1822.

imagine that we, islanders, could coerce the people of a continent 3,000 miles removed. Had Americans been permitted, in due time, to govern themselves, they never would have denied to the country the right of disposing of waste land; and by the judicious disposal of that we could not only have drawn home a considerable revenue, but have planted the new world with a superior race of men. Surely, in this more enlightened age, we may learn how to turn to profit the immense territory which we yet possess on the continent of America. Let the eye only glance over the map, from the St. Lawrence to the Pole; and, then let me ask, if it may not be for the honour of England, holding profit apart, to consider by what means so vast a region may be tenanted with civilised men - with happy souls and loyal subjects. Four years ago the charming possibility of this being realised dawned upon my mind; and I said that "England could spare 50,000 people annually, and be refreshed with the discharge." The truth has grown more and more obvious, and I now repeat it with perfect confidence. The vision of quickly and thickly peopling the earth with our species, brightens in my imagination day after day; and most earnestly would I entreat every benevolent mind to give serious attention to the subject. The idea may be easily realised. It requires but judicious application of capital which we have in abundance. It will pay: it may be resorted to, not only for the performance of the first great command to multiply and replenish; but for our individual advantage and our national aggrandizement: it may be looked forward to as the peaceful means of establishing a new and a better order of things in the world. Hitherto men's chief employment has been to butcher their kind. They have gone on from age to age, destroying and depopulating: they have striven to give aid to vice and misery. Why should it be so? Merciful God! What cause have we to quarrel with the people of the United States; or these people with their neighbours in Canada? Is there not room for us all, and should we not first consider how that room may be filled up? One and all of us may, for centuries to come, have positive and great advantage in settling the wastes of nature to their remotest verge. England alone could, in prosperity, easily supply 50,000 recruits annually, for emigration and settlement; and the United Kingdom 100,000. Yes! by the simplest arithmetic it can be proved if proof is called for.

Our North American Provinces should be confederated. They should hold congress in the month of June at Quebec. Lower Canada; Upper Canada; New Brunswick, having Gaspe and Prince Edward's Island laid to it; Nova Scotia having Cape Breton laid to it; and Newfoundland, might constitute five independent, but confederated provinces. Labrador: East, West, South and North Hudson, might fall into the confederacy as they became civilised and sufficiently populous; and, in the course of time, those parts of the United States whose waters issue by Quebec, (never to be gained over by conquest), would, I doubt not, join the Northern Confederacy, and swell the Government of the St. Lawrence to its natural size.

The best Constitution for a North American Province, while at nurse, would, in my opinion, be this: to consist of an Assembly chosen by the people, as in Canada; a Governor and Council. The Governor might be a military man, and have the commissioning of militia officers while he and the Council appointed judges, magistrates, etc., who should be subject to removal on the application of a certain large proportion, say four-fifths of the people, among whom they were appointed to act. The Council might consist of ten members or more; one half to be chosen by the people eligible to sit in the Assembly; the other half to be real men of business, sent from England on salaries for service. These men, besides doing duty in the Council, as advisers and legislators, might form a land-board, altogether independent of the Provincial Governors or Government, and be subservient, in that capacity, to a grand land-board at home. The grand national land-board, with its branches in several Provinces, might dispose of waste lands on strict business principles; and by a system, every way defined and adjusted, manage in the best possible manner for the public good. Accurate surveys and maps might be made, and exhibited both at home and abroad, for the expediting of business, either in purchase or exchange; and under the auspices of the land-board and its branches, a grand system of emigration might be organized and maintained in constant operation. There is nothing in mere magnitude which should frighten us. Magnitude in general may be made to contribute to success; and with systematic arrangement, and adequate means, may be turned to its utmost account, without difficulty, confusion, or failure. I avoid particulars. The subject of profitable emigration and settlement, is one to which I have devoted part of my third volume, and should the public happily conceive favourable opinions of schemes now hinted at, it shall be my utmost ambition to go on to practical illustration and detail. A few words on the fundamental principle may not be thrown away; they may assist in arresting attention. Land is valuable according to the degree of convenience attached to it; and other things being equal, increases in value as the density of population increases. A simple family planted down on a square mile, as is the case in Upper Canada, can have no convenience - no sufficient strength to make head against obstacles to improvement; and while the settler is held in misery, little value is added to the land he occupies. Plant down two families, twelve, twenty, or more, on the same extent of ground, and each addition, up to a certain proportion, insures greater and greater comfort and convenience to the whole, while an instant and great value is given to the soil. One solitary family, settled on a square mile, must pine for years, become poor, dispirited, beggarly, and brutal, while twenty families will not only retain their strength, their spirit and their manners, but instantly flourish, feel contented, feel happy, and become more and more ambitious to excel in activity and skill. England has thousands of people to spare;

and for her thousands of people she has millions of acres to settle and improve. She is the greatest land-owner on the globe, and she has the greatest command of capital. That capital is now running to waste; or worse than waste, it is running on to increase pauperism and idleness; idleness both among the rich and the poor. While this capital is yet at command, England may do wonders, by setting in motion a vast machinery at home and abroad but let this capital waste itself, as it is now doing, and a little time only will see its end, - a woful end!

Newfoundland now contains 70,000 permanent inhabitants. They are sending home petitions, to obtain a free and regular constitution of government. Let experiment be made there. Before the chartered constitutions of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or those of Canada, framed by Act of Parliament, are pulled to pieces, let Newfoundland have one framed without delay; and when that is found perfect, the older constitutions may be remodelled to correspond with it. An immediate experiment may also be made in rightly laying out and disposing of land in Newfoundland. In general, that country is unfavourable to cultivation but still it contains immense tracts, which, under good management, may be brought to value, and be accepted at once to the advantage of individuals, and the nation. At present, the people of Newfoundland are not allowed sufficient land, even for potato gardens. How monstrous! And this too, because of an absurd, antiquated notion, that the cultivation of the soil there, would injure the fisheries; it would enable us to cope with the people of the United States, in that trade, along the North American shores, where they are striving to rival, and, by all accounts, only require time to go beyond us, notwithstanding that our natural advantages are superior. But colonial policy is everywhere at war with nature. The people of Newfoundland would, no doubt, be willing to give a fair price for land, to suit their convenience; and a judicious mode of laying out, and disposing of land, as it came to be wanted, is of the utmost consequence to ensure that convenience, and make it valuable. The North American Provinces might choose three or more members each, to attend congress at Quebec; and one of these for each province, might be allowed to come home, and have a seat in the British Parliament, with liberty to speak, but not to vote. These members might, from the Congress being held in June annually visit England, and return to perform their duties at Quebec; and thus a direct, social, lively and watchful intelligence might be maintained between the home and colonial governments: all would be simple and efficacious; friendly and independent; active and harmonious. If desired by the provincials, one of our princes might reside at Quebec, as Viceroy, to be directed by ministers, subject to impeachment; and to the Viceroy might be given a power, much wanted abroad, to pardon offences of every kind: indeed, saving acknowledgment to the Sovereign of England,

the Viceroy might be clothed with every royal prerogative. At Quebec, too, a supreme judicial tribunal might be established to supersede the necessity of appealing to the King in Council at home; - a palpable bar to justice. The mere skeleton of provincial government is sufficient now to have exhibited. It is now only meant to attract notice to the subject, and to lay the foundation for mature discussion. Never did the necessity call more loudly for investigation into colonial policy, than now. We cannot indeed afford longer to trifle with this most important subject. Our colonial policy over the whole world is abominable; but in North America it ought most speedily to be seen to; for there it cannot be much longer endured, even though our Ministers had still means to riot in folly and extravagance, in holding colonies only for the portioning of their friends and relations. Bickerings between provincial assemblies and their governors are now continually heard of; and even the little Island of Bermuda has for years been in a state of distraction and discontent, from arbitrary proceedings. The cause is obvious. Colonial Governors are all of them armed with too much power, which, almost to a man, they abuse. They are blinded by the sycophants who surround them; and invariably become either stupid or mad. Our North American colonies afford in their history, not a single trace of common sense, discretion or economy. Mismanagement and misrule have prevailed and are prevailing. Not only do they yield no revenue, but, as consumers of British manufactures, the inhabitants are not half so advantageous to us as any like number of people in the United States; for this clear reason, that colonial policy has kept them spiritless and poverty-stricken. By the simplest and safest measures, all may be changed for the better. We may speedily lessen our expenditure, and, from improved management alone, we may at once have a direct revenue and flourishing people to deal with in trade.

My pen must not be laid down without noticing the opposite sentiments of politicians in and out of power. Ministers seem to have no idea of holding Canada, but by enfeebling the people; ruling over them by a wretched system of patronage and favouritism and guarding certain points by ships and fortifications. Most expensive works have, within the last two years, been commenced at Quebec and Isle-au-Noix, for military defence, while neither the one nor the other post could have a thousandth share in maintaining the province to Britain, in the event of invasion. In fact, all that is wanted for this, is the good will of the people to defend themselves, and with liberal treatment, that would never be wanting.

Our Opposition men run to another extreme. They are for abandoning Canada, or selling it to the United States. This is worse and worse. I can answer for the loyalty of the Canadians;

it abounds; and their desire to be independent of the United States is strong, from one end of the country to the other. All that they want is, the promise of independence now, and the reality after a given period of years. To attract notice to this most essential point, I have twice repeated the word in my engraved title-pages, and by accident the sun has been made to shine from the north to emblazon it. The moment that the promise of independence of granted, that moment all chance of discord and war between the United States and British America will cease, and England may forthwith begin to reduce her military and naval establishments in that quarter of the world. At Kingston and Sackett's Harbour immense ships of war are upheld, reproaching at once humanity and common sense. In a very few years these ships will be rotted, and why should not each nation, while the materials are yet fresh, have them disposed of for useful purposes? These and the Government stores, at Kingston and elsewhere, would go far to make good the navigation of the St. Lawrence; and nothing more can be required to have these safely disposed of, but a plain agreement with the United States, that the breaking up shall be mutual and simultaneous.

The late invasion of Canada by the people of the United States, was a burst of madness, of which these people are now ashamed, and which never would be repeated, were Canada independent of British Ministry. All of us rejoice in the independence of South America, now secured by years of civil war; and with that country there is now every reason to believe we shall cultivate a most friendly and profitable intercourse. How glorious would it be for Britain, while opportunity yet remains, to grant independence to both North American colonies! How glorious for her to enjoy the immortal honour of being the first nation upon earth to do justice to her progeny, - the first truly entitled to the endearing appellation of parent State!

A P P E N D I X IV..

To illustrate the business-like basis on which Gourlay built his "Upper Canada", the following extracts are appended. They are taken from the 365 pages he devotes to Township Reports.

(A)

SANDWICH.

At a meeting of the Resident Land Owners of the Township of Sandwich, in the Western District of Upper Canada, this 18th Day of December, 1817,

RESOLVED,

That an answer be given to the Queries of Mr. Robert Gourlay, for the information of our fellow subjects in Britain, who apparently are ignorant of the advantages in this section of the empire, when they emigrate into the dominions of foreign potentates, incongenial to their habits and feelings, and where they become for ever lost to their country.

2d. The township of Sandwich began to settle under the French government about the year 1750, and perhaps earlier, and contains at present about 200 inhabited houses, and about 1000 souls. The front on the river only is settled, with the exception of a few houses in the interior, and notwithstanding its nearness to market, and natural advantages, we do not know of one additional settler for this number of years.

3d. One Roman Catholic church, and two priests, no Protestant church or chapel (the same having been destroyed by the enemy during the late war), and but one preacher of the church of England.

4th. Two medical practitioners.

5th. One school, with one master, who draws a salary from the provincial fund, of £100 per annum, besides tuition fees. There are also two inferior schools, the teachers of which receive from the same fund £25 per annum, besides moderate fees.

6th. Thirteen shops or stores. 7th. 8 taverns.

8th. Eight wind-mills and one water-mill for grinding wheat. No saw or carding-mills. Inch pine boards are at present \$5 . per

thousand feet; but they will soon be at half that price.

9th. The face of the township is level, and much ditching required; the general character of the soil is yellow and black loam, with a clay under stratum. The middle of the township is sandy; but a mixture of these renders the soil warm and grateful to vegetation. Wild hay in abundance. Cattle thrive well.

10th. A great part of the township is a plain, and the timber most abounding is, white, red, and black oak, ash, elm, hickory, poplar, maple, and chestnut.

11th. No minerals, lime-stone, salt rock or springs, coal, plaster, or remarkable springs have as yet been discovered.

12th. No stone of any kind but what is transported from Malden, the next township, and sold from £3 to £3 15s. per toise, of 6 cubic feet. (1) In the quarry they may be had for 2s. 6d, per toise, and quarried for 7s. 6d. one mile from the river.

13th. Bricks are made, but not in a sufficient quantity, and are from £2 to £2 10s. per thousand at the kiln, though the soil is favourable for making them.

14th. No lime but what is brought from Malden, and generally sold at 1s. 3d. per bushel; but it can be made for much less, and has been sold at 7½d. per bushel

15th. Blacksmiths generally have shops of their own, and earn from £1 to £2 per day. (2) Carpenters and masons, 10s. per day, with board and lodging; and when they work by the piece, they calculate on more.

16th. Wages of common labourers, per annum, £25 to £37 10s. ; per winter month, £3 to £3 15s.; per day in harvest, 5s. to 6s. 3d.; women servants, £1 5s., per month, but very few are to be hired; spinners none.

17th. Mowing, reaping, and cradling, 5s. to 6s. 3d.

18th. Cost of clearing and fencing five acres of land, about £12 10s., on the average. Sometimes woodlands are given for a certain time, and then on shares to repay the person by whose labour it was cleared.

19th. The price of a work horse of four years, £12 10s., a cow £5, an ox £7 10s., and a sheep £1.

20th. Wool three to four pounds per fleece; some has had nine pounds and twenty pounds of tallow: common wool, 2s. 6d. per pound.

(1) I presume 6 feet cube was meant. -R.G.

(2) This seems extremely high; but I give it as given me. -R.G.

21st. About the 10th of April, and the 10th of December. Horned cattle are seldom housed; they do better under sheds, and if near the woods they browse, and want but very little fodder; horses the same, except those kept for work.

22nd. Sleighing season from the latter end of December, to the beginning of March; but commonly its duration is but two months, January and February; ploughing begins about the beginning of April.

23d. Sowing fall wheat in August and September, and reaping in July. Spring wheat is sown as early as the season will admit; in March, if the frost is out of the ground.

24th. One to one and a half bushels of wheat per acre, according to the richness of the ground: average crop about 10 bushels per arpent, (1) but when well cultivated it has been known to produce 20 bushels. The land is not as well cultivated here as in Britain; it has never more than one ploughing, and the sod has not sufficient time to rot and to pulverize.

25th. Blue grass and white clover, the natural production of the land; no made meadows to signify; yet an ox of four years in a summer's run, will gain about 120 lb. Milk is rich, and in the season overflows the pail. Butter excellent; cheese very little made; it is purchased from our neighbours over the straight, and is generally at 1s. 3d. per pound. Butter is from 1s. 3d. to 2s. 6d. per pound.

26th. Land is often cleared for the first crop, and sometimes three crops, according to the labour; and when taken, it is at for half the produce. Manure is seldom wanted but on old ground, for wheat; two or three crops of Indian corn is taken off new lands before wheat is sown.

27th. Land within fence, and fit for cultivation, is generally let out for half the produce; but there are few tenants of this description, as every one that chooses can get land of his own.

28th. The price of wild land about twenty years ago was from 1s. 3d. to 2s. 6d. per acre, and its progressive rise about 2s. 6d. for every five years. The present price of land is from 10s. to 15s. except in particular situations, such as lie on the straight. No lands have been recently sold in the township; the settlement has long been at a stand. Improved farms on the border of the straight, with a common farm-house, barn, and out-houses, orchard, and about 50 acres, within fence, would rate from £2 10s. to £6 5s. per acre. and more, according to the situation and value of the improvements.

29th. Several tracts of woodland are for sale; but for cleared and improved lands, high price would be the only inducement.

(1) The arpent is to the acre as 180 to 200.

30th. Only one road in front of the river, which is kept in tolerable repair. The back part of the township unsettled, except a few scattered houses; good roads might be made at a moderate expence. No water conveyance in the interior, and from the evenness of the ground, canals would add much to the value of the lands, and the encouragement of the settler.

31st. The want of some incentive to emulation, the reserve of two-sevenths of the lands for the crown and clergy, must for a long time keep the country a wilderness; a harbour for wolves; a hindrance to a compact and good neighbourhood; and as these reserves grow in value, they increase as a political inducement to an enemy. Other reasons may be added; a defect in the system of colonization, and too great a quantity of the lands in the hands of individuals who do not reside in the province, and who are not assessed for those lands. All these circumstances considered, it must be evident that the present system is very prejudicial to the internal welfare of this township.

(Signed)

Angus Mackintosh, J.P. Chairman.

F. Baby, J.P.

G. Jacob, J.P.

John M'Gregor.

J.B. Baby, J.P.

James M'Intosh.

James Woods.

Richard Pollard, Rector of Sandwich.

(Gourlay, op.cit., I, pp.275 - 280. The queries are sufficiently suggested in the answers. They will be found, however, *ibid.*, pp. 269 - 274.)

-----ooOoo-----

(B)

HEADS OF OPINIONS.

As to what retards the improvement of the Province.

- | | | |
|------|----------------|---|
| 1st. | In 24 Reports, | all lands of non-occupants. |
| 2d. | .. 19 | do. crown, clergy, and other reserves. |
| 3d. | .. 14 | do. want of people, especially men of capital and enterprise. |
| 4th. | .. 8 | do. want of money. |
| 5th. | .. 5 | do. shutting out Americans. |

6th.	In 4 Reports,		bad navigation of the St. Lawrence, and remoteness from market.
7th.	.. 3	do.	bad roads.
8th.	.. 3	do.	lands of Indians.
9th.	.. 2	do.	want of emigration, and of a liberal system of emigration.
10th.	.. 2	do.	difficulties opposed to emigrants, and poverty of beginners.
11th.	.. 1	do.	damages sustained by war.
12th.	.. 1	do.	want of indiscriminate and liberal admission of settlers from the United States.
13th.	.. 1	do.	indiscriminate admission of do.
14th.	.. 1	do.	want of incentive to emulation.
15th.	.. 1	do.	defect in the system of colonization.
16th.	.. 1	do.	lands in the hands of individuals un- willing to sell, and minors who cannot convey.
17th.	.. 1	do.	remoteness from market, and difficulty of communicating with the lower province.
18th	.. 1	do.	People, who got land, from the United States, and went off after selling it.
19th.	.. 1	do.	want of spirited and industrious men.
20th.	.. 1	do.	want of a bank (now supplied).
21st.	.. 1	do.	want of skill in husbandry.
22d.	.. 1	do.	bad habits of original settlers, soldiers, and bad characters, from the United States.
23d.	.. 1	do.	want of rousing up.

-----ooOoo-----

A P P E N D I X V.

In a letter to the Parliamentary Representatives of the People of Upper Canada, dated Niagara Jail, 7th June, 1819, Gourlay suggests, inter alia, the improvement of the St. Lawrence navigation as a "great national object", "Britain promoting the work with a loan of money, and the supply of hands". His calculation as to the expense involved is indicated in the extract given below. He makes it clear that there are never more than 5000 men on hand for whom to find employment during the four winter months.

"Let us exhibit a jotting of how things might go on; 5,000 able-bodied men could be transported from Britain, at the rate of £10 each, and be at work on the canal by the 1st of June, 1820

- - - - -	£50,000.
Transport of 10,000 women and children, supposed to accompany the men - - - - -	50,000.
Pay of 50,000 men at work, from 1st June till 1st December, 1820 - six months - - - - -	100,000.
Ditto, till 1st April, 1821, four months - - - - -	30,000.
Ditto, till 1st December, 1821, eight months - - - - -	130,000.
Transport of 5,000 men, with 10,000 women and children, 1821 - - - - -	100,000.
Pay of these second year's men, from 1st June till 1st December, 1821 - - - - -	100,000.
Interest and contingencies - - - - -	40,000

600,000

At this period discharge the first year's men who refund their transport, and have in pocket £10 per man - - - - -	100,000.
--	----------

Total expenditure up to 1st December, 1821 - -	500,000.
--	----------

Pay of second year's men, from 1st December, 1821 till 1st April, 1822 - - - - -	30,000.
Ditto, till 1st December, 1822, eight months - -	130,000.
Transport of third year's men with women and children - - - - -	100,000.
Pay of these men from 1st June, till 1st December 1822, six months - - - - -	100,000.
Interest and contingencies - - - - -	40,000.

900,000.

Deduct, refunded by the second year's men, now discharged - - - - -	100,000.
---	----------

Total expenditure up to 1st December, 1822 - - -	800,000.
--	----------

(From "Niagara Spectator", June 10, 1819;
Gourlay, "Introduction", CCCLXXXVIII ff.)

(1)

B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

I. PRIMARY.

(A) Official.

Parliamentary Debates:

Cobbett's "Political History", and "Parliamentary Debates";
Journals of the House of Commons;
Hansard.

Parliamentary Papers:

-Reports from Committees of the House of Commons as given
in the Journals of the House of Commons;

"On Convicts" by Sir C. Bunbury,	April 15, 1778, vol.36, p926.
do. do.	April 1, 1779, vol.37, p306
do. do.	March 22, 1784, vol.39, pl040.
do. Lord Beauchamp,	May 9, 1785, vol.40, p954
do. do.	July 23, 1785, vol.40, pl161.

-Reports from Committees of the House of Commons 1715-1801,
15 volumes and index.

"On the State of the Trade to Newfoundland", X, pp. 391-503;
1st. Report by Rt. Hon. Dudley Ryder, March 26, 1793.
2nd. Report by M. A. Taylor, Esquire, April 24, 1793.
3rd. Report by M. A. Taylor, Esquire, June 17, 1793.

"On the Petition of the Court of Directors of the Sierra
Leone Company, X, p.735 ff.
Report by Viscount Castlereagh, May 25, 1802,
Appendix I, History of the Settlement, p.737.

-Reports from Select Committees of the House of Commons;

"On Emigration", 1826, IV, 404, pp. 1-382; 1826-7, 88, 237, 550.

Four reports, chairman R. J. Wilmot Horton.

"On the State of the Civil Government of Canada",
1828, VII, 569, pp.375-730, chairman T.F.Lewis

"On the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies",
1836, XI, 512, pp.499-766, chairman H.G.Ward.

"On South Australia",
1841, IV, 119, 394, chairman Sir G. Grey.

-Report of the Earl of Durham on the Affairs of British North
America 1839, XVII, 3, 139, 303.

-Canada: 6-7 Edward VII, Sessional Paper 13.

(1) The classification is primarily from the point of view
of Public Opinion rather than that of Colonial Policy.

(B) General Works, Biographies and Memoirs.

- Anonymous: "Consolatory Thoughts on American Independence show advantages which will arise from it to the manufacturers, the agricultural and commercial Interests of Great Britain and Ireland" -by a Merchant, 1782.
- "The Colonial Policy of Great Britain considered with relation to North American provinces and West India possessions; wherein the dangerous tendency of American competition is developed and the necessity of recommending a Colonial System on a vigorous and extensive scale, exhibited and defended,"
-by a British traveller 1816.
- "Observations upon our present system of commercial intercourse with the continent of Europe shewing the necessity of a change of our commercial policy during the state of peace", 1816.
- "Letters to the Earl of Liverpool on the State of the Colonies", -by a Member of Parliament, 1821.
- "Plan of the General Colonial Land and Emigration Company", published for the Provisional Committee by ---blank---, 1836. (probably by E.G.Wakefield.)
- Albemarle, Earl of: "Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham",
(G.T.Keppel) 2 vols. 1852.
- Fitzmaurice, Lord: "Life of Shelburne", 3 vols. 1875.
(E.G.Petty)
- Chatham, Earl of: "Correspondence of William Pitt", ed. Taylor
(William Pitt) and Pringle, 4 vols. 1838-40.
- Bannister, Saxe: "Humane Policy; or Justice to the Aborigines",
1830.
"British Colonization and Coloured Tribes",
1838.
- Bentham, Jeremy: "Works", ed. Bowring, 11 vols. 1843.
- Blackstone, Sir W.: "Commentaries", ed. R.M.Kerr, 4th.ed. 4 vols.
1876.
- Bliss, Henry: "The Colonial System: Statistics of the Trade, Industry, and Resources of Canada, and the other Plantations in British America." 1833.
- Buller, Charles: "Sketch of Lord Durham's Mission to Canada in 1838", reprinted from the original in Sir Chas. Lucas' "Lord Durham's Report", III, pt.iii, p336.
"Responsible Government for Colonies", 2nd. ed.
1840.
"Speech on 'Systematic Colonization' in the House of Commons, April 6, 1843, reprinted in
"A View of the Art of Colonization", pp.475-500.

- Burke, Edmund: "European Settlements in America", 2 vols. 1750.
 "Works", 2 vols. 1834.
 "Correspondence", 1744-1797, ed. Fitzwilliam and Bourke, 4 vols. 1844.
- Capper, H.: "South Australia", 1837.
- Clarkson, Thomas: "The History of the Rise, Progress and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the Slave Trade by the British Parliament", 2 vols. 1808.
- Colquhoun, Patrick: "Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis", 1796.
- Donne, W. Bodham: see George III.
- Eden, William: "New Holland", 1787.
 (Baron Auckland)
- Edwards, Bryan: "The History of the British Colonies in the West Indies", 2 vols. 1793.
- Encyclopedia Britannica, 5th. ed. 1815.
- Supplement to above, 1824.
- Franklin, Benjamin: "Works", ed. A.H. Smyth, 1907.
- George III: "Correspondence of, with Lord North from 1763 to 1783", ed. W. Bodham Donne, 2 vols. 1867.
- Gifford, John: "The Political Life of William Pitt", 3 vols. 1809.
- Goldsmith, Oliver: "The Miscellaneous Works of Oliver Goldsmith MB" ed. James Prior, 4 vols. 1837.
- Gourlay, Robert: "The Right to Church Property Secured", 1815.
 (Fleming) "An Inquiry into the State of the Cottagers in the Counties of Lincoln and Rutland", 1801, in Annals of Agriculture, XXXVII,
 "Statistical Account of Upper Canada compiled with a View to a Grand System of Emigration", 2 vols. 1822.
 "General Introduction, &c." (to above), 1822.
- Greville, C.G. "Memoirs".
- Hinds, Dr. Samuel: "Essay on Colonization", an appendix to "Thoughts on Secondary Punishment", by the Archbishop of Dublin, reprinted in "The Art of Colonization", pp. 107-109.
 (Bishop of Norwich)
- Horton, Sir R.J.W.: "The Causes and Remedies of Papperism in the United Kingdom considered", Introductory Series, 1830.

- Horton, Sir R.J.W. "An Inquiry into the Causes and Remedies of Pauperism", 1st., 2nd., 3rd. and 4th. Series. 1830, (bound with above, paged as five).
"Exposition and Defence of Earl Bathurst's Administration of the Affairs of Canada when Colonial Secretary, 1822 to 1827 inc.", 1838.
"Ireland and Canada", 1839.
- Hume, David: "Essays", (Pt. I, 1742, Pt. II, 1752) 2 vols. 1788.
- Johnson, Dr. S.: "Works", 12 vols. 1792.
- Lambert, John: "Travels through Canada and the United States in 1806, '07 and '08", 2 vols. 2nd. ed. 1814.
- Lewis, Sir G.C.: "The Letters of, " ed. Sir Edmund Head, 1864.
"The Government of Dependencies", (1841)
ed. Sir Charles Lucas, 1891.
- Meadley, G.W.: "Memoirs of William Paley, D.D.", 1809.
- Malthus, Rev. R.T.: "On Population", 2 vols. 6th. ed. 1826.
- McCulloch, J.R.: see Adam Smith.
Article, "Colonial Policy - The Value of Colonial Possessions", Edinburgh Review, vol. 42, August, 1825.
- Merivale, Herman: "Lectures on Colonies and Colonization", 2 vols. 1842: also, new ed., 1861.
- Mill, James: Article, "Colony", Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica, 1824.
- Mill, J.S.: "Principles of Political Economy", ed. Ashley, 1917.
- Molesworth, Sir.W.: "Selected Speeches", ed. Prof. Egerton, 1903.
- Parnell, Sir Henry: "On Financial Reform", 1830.
- Pellev, Hon. George: "Life and Correspondence of Rt. Hon. Henry Addington, 1st. Viscount Sidmouth", 3 vols. 1847
- Scott, Sir Walter: "The Journal of, ", ed. D. Douglas, 2 vols. 1890.
- Selkirk, Earl of: "Observations on the Present State of the Highlands of Scotland with a view of Causes and probable Consequences of Emigration", 1805.
(Thomas Douglas)
- Sheffield, Lord: "Observations on the Commerce of the American States", new (6th) ed., 1784.

- Shortt & Doughty: "Documents relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759-91", ed. with notes, 1918
- Sinclair, Sir John: "The History of the Public Revenue of the British Empire"; Pts. I and II, 1785; Pt. III, 1790; 3 vols. 1803.
- Smith Dr. Adam: "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations", ed. McCulloch, 4 vols. 1828, ed. J.E.T. Rogers, 2 vols. 1869.
- Smith, Sidney: Article, "Account of the English Colony of New South Wales", Edinburgh Review, vol. 2, April 1803
Article, "America", ibid. vol. 33, January, 1820.
- Stair, Earl of: (John Dalrymple) "Facts and their Consequences submitted to the Consideration of the Public at Large; but more particularly to that of the Finance Ministers" 4th. ed. 1782.
"An Argument to prove, that it is the Indispensable Duty of the Creditors of the Public to insist that the Government do forthwith bring forward the Consideration of the State of the Nation", 3rd. ed. 1783
"An Address to and Expostulation with the Public", 1784.
- Talbot, Ed. Allen: "Five Years Residence in Canada" 1824.
- Taylor, Sir Henry: "The Statesman", 1836.
"Autobiography". 2 vols. 1885.
"Correspondence of, ", ed. Edward Dowden, 1888.
- Torrens, Col. R.: "Self-supporting Emigration: a Paper on the means of reducing the poor's rates and of affording effectual and permanent relief to the labouring classes", reprinted from No. XX of the "Pamphleteer", 1817.
"Substance of a Speech ---- on Emigration", 2nd. ed. 1827.
"Systematic Colonization: Ireland saved without cost to the Imperial Treasury", 2nd. ed. 1849.
- Wakefield, E.G.: "A Letter from Sydney; the principal town of Australasia", 1829.
"Facts relating to the Punishment of Death in the Metropolis", 2nd. ed., 1832.
"England and America", 2 vols. (in one), 1833.
"South Australia: Outline of the Plan of a proposed Colony to be founded on the South Coast of Australia; with an Account of the Soil, Climate, Rivers, &c., with Maps", 1834.

- Wakefield, E.G.: "A View of Sir Charles Metcalfe's Government in Canada", 1844.
 "Sir Charles Metcalfe in Canada", Fisher's Colonial Magazine, 1844.
 "View of the Art of Colonization with present reference to the British Empire", 1849.
- Walpole, Horace: "Journal of the Reign of King George III, 1771-1783", short title, "Last Journals", ed. Dr. Doran, 2 vols. 1859
- Walpole, Spencer: "A History of England" 1890.
- Wentworth, W.C.: "A Statistical Account of the British Settlements in Australasia", 3rd. ed. 2 vols., 1824.
- Wilberforce, R.I.&S: "Life of Wilberforce", 5 vols. 1838.
- Wraxall, Nathaniel William; "The Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of, " 1772-1784, ed. H.B.Wheatley, 5 vols. 1884.

(C) Contemporary Periodicals.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| The Gentleman's Magazine, | The Annual Register. |
| The Scots Magazine, | The Pamphleteer. |
| The Edinburgh Review, 1802- | |
| The Quarterly Review, 1809- | |
| The Penny Magazine. | |

II. SECONDARY.

- Andrews, Alexander: "History of British Journalism", 2 vols. 1859.
- Ashley, W.J.: "British Dominions", ed. W.J.Ashley, 1911.
- Beer, J.L.: "The Old Colonial System", Pt. I in 2 vols. 1912.
- Bell, Sidney Smith: "Colonial Administration of Great Britain", 1854.
- Benn, A.W.: "Modern England", 2 vols. 1908.
- Bonwick, James,: "The First Twenty Years in Australia", 1882.
- Broderick, G.C. and Fotheringham, G.K. "The Political History of England", vol 11, 1906.
- Bryce, Lord: "Modern Democracies", 1921.
- Buckle, Henry Thos.: "The History of Civilisation in England", new ed. 3 vols., 1902.

"Cambridge Modern History."

"Cambridge History of Foreign Policy", ed.

Cannan, Dr. Edwin: "Theories of Production and Distribution from 1776 to 1843", 2nd. ed. 1903.

Conolly, M.F.: "Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Men of Fife", 1866.

Cunningham, Dr. W.: "Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times", 2 vols., 1921

Currey, C.H.: "British Colonial Policy, 1783 to 1915",

Dicey, A.V.: "Law and Public Opinion in England during the Nineteenth Century", 2nd. ed. 1914.

"Dictionary of National Biography".

Dilke, Sir Chas. W.: "Problems of Greater Britain", 4th. ed. 1890.

Doyle, J.A.: "The English in America", 5 vols. 1882-1907.

Egerton, H.E.: "A Short History of British Colonial Policy", 4th. ed. 1913.
 "The Colonial Reformers of 1830" in "Kings College Lectures on Colonial Problems", ed. by Professor Hearnshaw, 1913, pp.143-180.
 "The Causes and Character of the American Revolution", 1923.

Egerton, H.E. and Grant, W.L.: "Canadian Constitutional Development shown by Selected Speeches and Despatches", 1907.

Escott, T.H.S.: "Edward Bulwer, First Baron Lytton of Knebworth" 1910.

Fawcett, Mrs. "Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir William Molesworth", 1901

Garnett, Dr. Richard: "Edward Gibbon Wakefield", (Builders of Greater Britain), 1897.

Gladstone, W.E.: "Our Colonies", speech to the Mechanics' Institute, Chester, November 12, 1855.

Goldman, C.S.: "The Empire and the Century", ed. C.S. Goldman, 1905.

Gresswell, Wm. Parr: "The Growth and Administration of the British Colonies, 1837-1897", 1898.

- Grey, Earl: "The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration", 2 vols. 1853.
- Hall, H. Duncan: "The British Commonwealth of Nations", 1920.
- Heatley, D.P.: "Studies in British History and Politics", 1913.
- Hunt, Dr. William: "The Political History of England", vol 10, 1905.
- Johnson, S.C.: "A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America", 1913.
- Johnston, Sir H.H.: "Pioneers in Australasia", 1913.
"The Opening up of Africa", (Home University Library), n.d.
- Keltie, Dr. J.Scott: "The Partition of Africa".
- Kennedy, W.P.M.: "The Constitution of Canada", 1922.
- Kennedy, William: "English Taxation 1640-1799.", 1913.
- Kent, C.B.R.: "The English Radicals".
- Kingsford: "History of Canada".
- Knowles, L.C.A.: "The Industrial and Commercial Revolution in Great Britain during the Nineteenth Century", New ed. 1922.
- Levi, L.: "History of British Commerce", 1880.
- Lecky, W.E.H.: "History of England in the Eighteenth Century", 7 vols. 1906.
"Historical and Political Essays", new ed. 1910.
- Lewis, Sir.G.C.: "Administration of Great Britain 1783-1830", ed. Sir Edmund Head, 1864.
- Lucas, Sir Charles: "Lord Durham's Report", 3 vols., 1912.
- May, Sir T.Erskine: "The Constitutional History of England", cont. by Francis Holland, 3 vols. 1912.
- Meikle, H.W.: "Scotland and the French Revolution", 1912.
- Mills, Arthur, "Colonial Constitutions", 1856.
- Mills, R.C.: "The Colonization of Australia, (1829-1842)", Introduction by Dr. Graham Wallas, 1915.
- Morison, J.L.: "British Supremacy and Canadian Self-government" 1919.

- Muir, Ramsay: "A Short History of the British Commonwealth",
vol.I, 1920.
- Nicholson, J.S.: "A Project of Empire", 1909.
- Payne, E.J.: "The Colonies", part II of "Colonies and
Dependencies", by J.S.Cotton and E.J.Payne 1883.
- Poley, A.P.: "The Imperial Commonwealth", 1921.
- Pollard, A.F.: "The British Empire", ed. A.F.Pollard, 1909.
- Porritt, Edward: "The Fiscal and Diplomatic Freedom of the
British Oversea Dominions", 1922.
- Pringle-Pattison,
A. Seth: "The Philosophical Radicals", 1907.
- Robertson, C.Grant: "England under the Hanoverians", 1911.
"Select Cases, Statutes and Constitutional
Documents", 4th. ed. 1923.
- Rogers, Rev. Charles: "Memorials of the Scottish House of Gourlay",
1888.
- Rose, J.Holland: "The Life of William Pitt", Pts. I and II, 1923.
"Pitt and Napoleon Miscellanies".
- Russell, Earl: "The English Government and Constitution".
new edition, 1865.
"Recollections and Suggestions", 1875.
- Schmoller, Gustav: "The Mercantile System" (Economic Classics)
ed. W.L.Ashley, 1896.
- Sidgwick, Henry: "Elements of Politics",
- Stephen, Leslie: "English Thought in the Eighteenth Century",
2 vols. 1876.
"The English Utilitarians", 3 vols. 1900.
- Trevelyan, G.M.: "British History in the Nineteenth Century",
1922.